THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

GURNEY
WOODSTOCK ST W.

University of London

Presented by
the Worshipful Company
of Goldsmiths.
1903.

HANSARD'S
PARLIAMENTARY
DEBATES:

FORMING A CONTINUATION OF
" THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY OF ENGLAND,
FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE
YEAR 1803."

Third Series;

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF WILLIAM IV.

VOL. I.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM
THE TWENTY-SIXTH DAY OF OCTOBER,
TO
THE TWENTIETH DAY OF DECEMBER, 1830.

First Volume of the Session.

LONDON:
Printed by T. C. HANSARD *Pater-noster-Row,*
FOR BALDWIN AND CRADOCK; J. BOOKER; LONGMAN, REES, ORME, AND CO.;
J. M. RICHARDSON; PARBURY, ALLEN, AND CO.; J. HATCHARD AND SON;
J. RIDGWAY; E. JEFFERY AND SON; J. RODWELL; CALKIN AND BUDD;
R. H. EVANS; J. BOOTH; AND T. C. HANSARD.

1831.

619863

REFERENCE ONLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME I.

THIRD SERIES.

I. Subjects of Debate in the House of Lords.

II Subjects of Debate in the House of Commons.

III. The King's Speech.

IV. The King's Messages.

V. Addresses to the King.

VI. Lists of Divisions in the House of Commons.

◆

I. Subjects of Debate in the House of Lords.

1830.

Oct. 26. Opening of Parliament .. *Page* 1

27. Royal Assent to the choice of a Speaker .. 6

Nov. 2. Address in Answer to the King's Speech .. 11

4. Declaration against Ministers, made by the Earl of Winchilsea 198

8. Belgium — Motion for Papers concerning Belgium — by the Marquis of Lansdown .. 246
King's intended visit to the City of London—Explanation given by the Duke of Wellington .. 250

9. Distress of the Mining Interests—Petition .. 316

11. The Royal Visit to the City—Question by the Earl of Radnor 365
Coal Trade—Petition to have the Tax taken off .. 370
Employment of Labourers'—The Earl of Winchilsea's Bill, first reading .. 371

12. Kildare-Street Society—Petition against giving it the public money .. 421
Outrages in Kent and Sussex—Explanations by Lord Teynham and the Duke of Richmond .. 422

15. New Police—Petition against it—Defence of it .. 493
The Regency Bill, first reading .. 500

Nov. 16. Resignation of the Prime Minister .. .. .. *Page* 558
Clerk of the Council—Question concerning this appointment 559

18. Amendment of the Common Law—Lord Tenterden's Bills, first reading 571

22. The Poor Laws—Postponement of a Motion, by the Marquis of Salisbury, for a Committee 603
Ministerial Declarations—Principles professed by the New Ministers 665

25. New Police—Petitions against it 665
Reform in Parliament—City of London Petition 665
Regency Bill—Notice of second reading 667

26. Parliamentary Reform and Negro Slavery—Lord Chancellor (Lord Brougham's) remarks on his own conduct 672

29. State of the Country—Conduct of the Lord Lieutenant as to the Magistracy—Advice given them by the Lord Chancellor .. 677
Administration of the Poor Laws—A Committee appointed to inquire into them, on the Motion of the Marquis of Salisbury 687

30. Slavery—Ambulatory Committee—Lord Napier recommends such a Committee to be sent to the West Indies 691
Amendments in Law Proceedings—Lord Wynford's Measures—A Bill read a first time, to improve the practice of Courts of Common Law 691

Dec. 1. Slavery—Earl Grosvenor's Recommendation 706

2. Encouragement of Education in Ireland—Petitions against the Kildare-street Society 707
Courts of Local Jurisdiction—The Lord Chancellor Brougham's Bill read a first time 707

3. Complaint by the Duke of Newcastle, of the language used at Nottingham by the Attorney General 750
Regency Bill—Report brought up and a clause added 763

6. Regency Bill, third reading 764

8. Repeal of the Union (Ireland)—Petitions 816
The Lord Chancellor of Ireland—Question concerning his appointment 816
Case of Francis Sisk—Legality of Public Processions to Address the King 821

9. State of the Country—Lord Wynford's Motion for a Committee to inquire into it 828

10. Distress—Conduct of the late Ministry—Attack of the Earl of Radnor 957
Slavery in the Colonies—Petitions 964

13. Recent Appointments—Conduct of the New Ministry in filling up Offices 1024

Dec. 14. Tithes—Petition from Southampton .. .. *Page* 1109
Repeal of the Duty on Sea-borne Coals—Petition from London 1115
The Law of Scotland—Landlords' rights—A Bill to alter the Law on this subject, brought in by the Lord Chancellor .. 1117

15. Parliamentary Reform—Petition from Scotland in favour of it 1182

16. Repeal of the Union with Ireland—Petition for it, from Tradesmen of Dublin 1201
Tithes—Ireland—Returns concerning them ordered—Effects of the want of a system of Commutation 1202
Slavery—Petition from Glasgow, praying for cautious measures in abolishing it 1204
The Regency Bill—The Amendments made by the Commons agreed to 1204
Reform—Petition from Aldgate Ward 1205

17. Reform in Church and State—Petition 1290
Norfolk Circuit—Lord Chancellor's Patronage 1295

20. Desire for Reform in Scotland—Petition from Linlithgow .. 1338
Earl Stanhope's reply to the Lord Chancellor 1340
Lunatics—Motion for Returns—Lord Chancellor's suggestion to establish a Commission to examine when they are recovered 1341
Patents Continuation Bill, second reading 1345
Settlement on the Swan River, complaints of its injudiciousness, and Motions for Returns concerning it 1345
Suits in Common Law Courts, second reading of Lord Wynford's Bill 1349

II. SUBJECTS OF DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Oct. 26. Choice of a Speaker 2
Business of the House—Mode of arranging it for the Session .. 5

Nov. 2. Parliamentary Reform—Mr. Brougham's notice on the subject 54
Address in answer to the King's Speech 55

3. Imprisonment for Small Debts—Petition—Sir Robert Peel's Explanation in relation to a Law for regulating it 128
Management of Public Business—Mode of arranging it for the Session 130
Report on the Address 143

4. Mr. Hume's advice to Ministers 200
Abolition of the Oath of Abjuration—Motion for leave to bring in a Bill 200
Treaties relative to the Netherlands—Motion that some of them be laid before the House 208

5. Riots in Ireland—Returns of the persons killed in them.. .. 210
Parliamentary Reform—Petition from Cockermouth 210

Nov. 5. Revenues of Lancaster and Cornwall—Return of the Expense of Managing them .. .. *Page* 213
Members of Parliament—Motion for them to make a Return of the Number of their Electors 213
Distress of the Country—Inflammatory Language—Mr. Hume accused of using exciting words 214
Supply—Recrimination—Mr. Hume retorts 229
Administration of Justice—Ireland—Motion for leave to bring in a Bill to extend to that Country the Act of last Session .. 236
Poor Laws—Motion for Bill to amend them, by Mr. Weyland 237
Patent of the King's Printer—Motion for a Copy of this Patent —Attack on the Office 237
Government Pensions—Motion for a Return of those granted to the Widows of Officers 244

8. Absence of Ministers from the House of Commons—complained of by Mr. Brougham 266
The Royal Visit to the City—Explanations concerning its postponement 266
Slavery—Arrangements for bringing it under Discussion 296
Interference with the affairs of Belgium—Postponement of Mr. Hobhouse's intended Motion 297
Intercourse between the West Indies and America—Committee on the Acts regulating it—Resolutions to amend them agreed to 299
Sheriffs—(Ireland)—Leave given to bring in a Bill to regulate the Office 315

9. Repeal of the Union—Personalities—Petition from Waterford —Attack by Mr. G. Dawson and others on Mr. O'Connell 318
Slave Evidence—Question by Mr. Brougham 330
Truck System—Misrepresentation—Mr. Littleton and Mr. O'Connell 331
Public Relief for the Poor—Question by Mr. Portman 334
Recovery of Small Debts—Question by Mr. Sykes 338
Amendment of the Statute of Frauds—Solicitor General obtains Leave to bring in a Bill to amend this Statute 338
Officers of the Army—Question by Mr. Hume 346
Sussex Jury Bill—Second Reading 347
Slavery—Petition 349

10. Absence of Ministers—Peaceable Conduct of the People .. 351
Dr. Phillpotts—Notice of a Motion concerning his Appointment 352
Taxation and Reform—Petition from Mary-le-bone 353
Colonial Slavery—Petition presented by Mr. Brougham .. 359
Local Jurisdiction Bill brought in 359
Attornies Breach of Privilege—Complaint by Mr. Brougham 359
Civil List—Privy Council—Questions put as to the Returns .. 364

11. Agricultural Distress—Taxation—Petition from Tenterden .. 383
Case of Dr. Phillpotts—A Communication made to the House on behalf of that Gentleman 385

Page
Nov. 11. Subletting Act—A Motion to Repeal it made by Mr. O'Connell 386
State of the Poorer Classes (Ireland)—A Committee to inquire into, re-appointed 409

12. Irish Corporation Fund—Petition from Athlone 426
Newspaper and Stamp Duties—Petition from Manchester.. .. 426
Distress—Petitions from places in Wiltshire 426
English Pension List—Question by Mr. R. Gordon 428
Civil List—Chancellor of the Exchequer explains his plan and proposes Resolutions in a Committee 429
West-India Trade with America—Report on the Acts regulating it brought up—An Amendment to the Schedule proposed .. 471
Oaths of Abjuration Bill—Second Reading 486
Subletting Act Amendment Bill—Sir H. Hardinge obtains leave to bring it in 486
Census for Ireland—A Bill to take it ordered to be brought in 491

15. Duty on Sea-borne Coals—Petition against from Coal Owners at Newcastle 510
Irish Landlords—Explanation concerning their Conduct 513
Clerk of the Council—Question concerning the Appointment 514
Protestant Soldiers and Catholic Worship—Petition from Bossiney 514
Reform—Scotch Burghs—Petition from Cupar, Fife 515
Forfar Election—Decision on Election Petitions 518
Incendiaries in the Country—Question by Mr. Holme Sumner—Explanations by Sir R. Peel and Mr. Hume 519
Civil List Committee—Sir H. Parnell moves an Amendment to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Motion 525
Clerk of the Council—Reiterated Question as to the Appointment 555

16. Parliamentary Reform—Petitions from Bridport and London .. 559
Resignation of Ministers—Sir R. Peel states this circumstance 562
Petersfield Election—A Petition complaining of the return .. 564

17. Postponement of Election Committees—A suggestion made to this effect, but not persevered in 566
Dr. Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter—Question put by Sir James Graham as to holding the Living of Stanhope *in commendam* 569

18. Reform—Dartmouth Petition 573
Church of Ireland—Observations on its character 574
Metropolitan Police—Petition complaining of its Expense from St. John's, Southwark—Defence of the Police 575
Game Laws—A Bill to amend them introduced by the Marquis of Chandos 582
Attestation of Powers—A Bill to amend the Law on this subject brought in by the Solicitor General 582

19. Repeal of the Union with Ireland—Explanations as to the Sentiments of the People of Ireland 583
Criminal Law—Petition for its Amendment from the Grand Juries of London 589

Nov. 19. Administration of Justice in Gibraltar—Petition complaining of it .... *Page* 590
Corporation Abuses (Ireland)—Petition from Galway .. 591
Oppression of the Peasantry—Ireland—conduct of Earl Fitzwilliam and other Irish Landlords 592
Administration of Justice Bill—The Report brought up .. 595
Labouring Poor—A Bill to improve their condition, brought in and read a first time by Lord Nugent 596

22. Dr. Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter—Account of his preferments, by Mr. Phillpotts 620
The Late and the New Ministry—Conduct of the former, and hopes of the latter 624
Mary-le-bone Select Vestry—Petition against 626
Reform of Parliament—Nottingham Petition 627
Sussex Grand Jury Bill—The third reading postponed .. 628
Reduction of Official Salaries—New Ministers—Mr. Hume withdraws a Motion, for Returns relating to Salaries .. 629
Public Disturbances—Ballots for Election Committees—Conduct of the Local Magistracy and of the Government 631
Duchy of Lancaster—Impropriety of keeping up the Offices of that Establishment 635

23. Conduct of Lord Brougham—His consistency questioned by Mr. Croker 635

Colonial Slavery—Petition from Leeds—Postponement of the Question of the Abolition of Slavery 649
Adjournment during the absence of Ministers 652
Lieutenant General of the Ordnance—Question—Office not to be filled up 654
Distress in Ireland—Petition from Tipperary, complaining of Distress—Plans of relief recommended 655

25. Bequests of Roman Catholics—Mr. O'Connell obtains leave to bring in a Bill to secure these Bequests in England 668
Church Rates—A Motion for a return of the amount of them, made and withdrawn 669
Law of Real Property—Notice of an intention to bring in a Bill after the Recess 672

30. Stamford Election Committee—Petition for the extension of time 703
Expense of the New Police—Returns of it ordered 704
Postmaster General—Ireland—the office not to be filled up 706

Dec. 2. Tregony Borough Election—Petition praying for an extension of time 741
Law of Enfeoffment—Scotland—Leave given to bring in a Bill to amend this Law 742
Tests—Ireland—Leave given to bring in a bill to amend the Law imposing Tests on Protestants 743
Freeholders in Ireland—Returns of the number of them, ordered 744
Colonial Acts, Validity Bill—Committee on it postponed .. 746

Dec. 2. Pensions and Salaries—Post Master General of Ireland—Amount of Salaries of upwards of 1,000*l.* .. .. *Page* 746

Adulteration of Beer—Motion for a Return of the number of those convicted for this offence 749

6. Parliamentary Reform—Armagh Petition—Opinions expressed against the Ballot 768

Repeal of the Union—Petitions from Wicklow 772

Division of Legal Appointments—Complaints that the Irish do not get their share of them 777

Vice-Treasurer of Ireland—The office to be regulated 778

Parliamentary Reform—Petitions from individuals for it .. 779

Postmaster General (Ireland)—Explanations 779

Salaries, Pensions, and National Distress—Necessity of inquiring into the Mal-administration of the Poor Laws 780

Supply—Army—Vote for the expense of the Army 790

Windsor Castle—Vote for the expense of repairing it 791

Rideau Canal—Vote for Money to carry it on .. 794

Adjournment of the House for the Recess 796

7. Salaries and Employments—Lord Althorp gives notice that he means to move for a Committee to inquire into them 797

Civil List—Explanation of the course which the new Ministers propose to pursue 798

Lord Chancellor of Ireland—Objections made to appointing a new one 798

Committee on the Civil List—Discussion as to the propriety of continuing the old one, or appointing a new one 799

Votes of Burgesses—A return of the number of Burgesses moved for 801

Recent Pensions—Question as to those granted by the late Ministry 802

Scotch Law of Entail—Leave given to bring in Bills to amend the Law 802

Return of the Metropolitan Police—Expense of this Establishment 807

Charitable Institution—The second reading of the Bill for exempting them from Parochial charges 809

Improvement of the Game Laws—Second reading of the Bill brought in by the Marquis of Chandos 810

Corn Laws—Averages—Scarcity—Observations on these subjects in moving for Returns 814

8. Stamps on Newspapers—Petition from Derby against these taxes 825

Duties on Sea-borne Coals—Questions to Mr. Spring Rice as to his intention to move for the repeal of these Duties .. 826

9. Parliamentary Reform—Petitions—The Ballot 895

Repeal of the Union—Personalities between some of the Representatives of Ireland and other Members 901

Power of Grand Juries (Ireland)—A motion to place Resolutions on the Journals concerning them, and plans for their improvement 909

Dec. 9. The Living of Stanhope—The decision of Ministers concerning Dr. Phillpotts' holding it .. .. .. *Page* 932
Salaries of Public Offices—Appointments of a Committee to inquire into them—Discussion of the Law Appointments in Ireland 932
Electors in Cities and Boroughs—Motion for Returns .. 953
Court of Chancery—The presentment of John Shuckburgh and others, on March 8th, in the fortieth year of the reign of Elizabeth, ordered to be laid before the House 953
Regency Bill—Second reading 954

10. Local Courts of Judicature—Petition from Reading for the measure 970
Assessed Taxes—Petition from Lincoln for the Repeal of them 971
Reform of Parliament—Petitions—The Ballot—Refusal of the people in Kent to be sworn in Special Constables 972
Parliamentary Grants for Education (Ireland)—Petitions against the Kildare-Street Society 975
Supply—Bank of England—Question as to the probable conduct of Ministers concerning this Company 980
East India Company's Charter—Question as to the re-appointment of the Committee 982
Reduction of Salaries Committee—Observations on the impropriety of placing Ex-ministers on this Committee 982
The Jews—When is the question concerning them to be discussed? 985
Procession of the Trades to St. James's—Legality of Processions to go up with Addresses to the King—Conduct of the Trades of London 985
Regency Bill—Committee—Amendments 996
Church of England Residents and Non-residents—Returns concerning them and their Income 998

11. Repeal of the Union—Ireland—State of Ireland before and since the Union—Conduct of the Agitators 1000
Pensions recently granted—Questions concerning them .. 1020

13. Borough of Evesham Election—Report of the Committee that the sitting Members were not duly elected 1042
Parliamentary Reform—Petition from Scotland 1044
Truck System—Petitions 1044
The New Metropolitan Police—Petition complaining of its Expense 1046
West-India Colonies — Slavery Petition from the West-India Body — Propriety of granting Compensation to the Planters 1047
Supply—Pensions—incorrect Returns 1066
Ambassadors—The expense of them 1067
The Currency—Question as to altering it 1068
Unnecessary Places—Specimen of them in the Court of Chancery—Conduct of the late and present Administration in granting them 1069
Ways and Means—Manner of voting the Estimates .. 1086
Increase of the Army—Expense of that body .. 1090

Dec. 13. Supply—Causes of Discontent .. .. .. *Page* 1094
The Currency 1101
State of the Country 1103
Regency Bill—Report and Amendments 1107
Judgment and Execution Bill—Second reading postponed .. 1107
Continuation of Patents—First reading of the Bill 1108

14. Evesham Election — Motion for printing the Evidence taken before the Committee—Conduct of the Electors 1119
Stamford Election—Postponed 1123
Sea-borne Coals—Petition from the Corporation of London .. 1124
Corporation of Galway and Kilkenny (Ireland)—Abuses committed by them 1126
The Truck System Mr. Littleton's Bill—Motion for leave to bring it in 1133

15. Compensation to West-India Proprietors—Petition from certain Members of that body 1183
Pensions on the Civil List—(Ireland) — Motion for Returns concerning them 1184
The Jews—Petition from the Jews of London—Influence of the Oaths of Abjuration Bill on their political condition .. 1185
Sinecures in Scotland — Explanation concerning those possessed by Mr. William Dundas 1185
Dr. Phillpotts—The Living of Stanhope is not to be held *in commendam* by the Bishop of Exeter 1187
Magistracy of Ireland—Motion for various Returns concerning the persons in the Commission of the Peace in Ireland .. 1188

16 Carrickfergus Election — Petition complaining of signatures being forged to a Petition on this subject 1203
Select Vestries—Petition against them from St. James's, Westminster 1203
Grants for Education—The Elective Franchise (Ireland)—Petition against the Kildare-Street Society—Petition for an extension of the Franchise of Freeholders of Ireland .. 1205
Cobbett's Register—Question if that Publication had attracted the attention of the Attorney General 1209
Reform in Church and State—Petition from Southampton .. 1210
Evesham Election—Motion for superseding the issue of the Writ 1217
General Register for Deeds—Motion for leave to bring in a Bill to establish a General Register for all Deeds 1233
Court of Chancery—Sir E. B. Sugden's plan—Abuses in the different Offices—Salaries to the different Registrars and Clerks 1268

17. Privileges of Parliament—Borough of Beeralston Right of the House to issue a Writ on the presumed elevation to the Peerage of one of its Members 1299
Tax on Printed Cottons Petition for its repeal — Onerous nature of this Tax 1304
Repeal of the Union—Ireland Petitions 1306
Linen Trade in Ireland 1307

Dec. 17. Alleged Libellous Publication—Observations on Cobbett's Register postponed .. .. *Page* 1311
West-India Trade with America—(Postponement of the measure for regulating it) 1311
Carrickfergus Election—Petition concerning it, alleged to have forged signatures appended referred to a Committee .. 1316
State of the Labouring Classes—Spade Husbandry—Petitions from Sussex presented by Mr. Curteis—Wages of the labourers there and claims of the agriculturists for relief 1316
Taxation and Tithes Petitions from Horsham and Selsea, presented by Mr. Hume, praying for reduction of Taxation and alteration in Tithe Laws 1332

18. Liverpool Election—Notice given by the Marquis of Blandford of an intention to bring it before the House 1338

20. Church Establishment in Ireland—A copy of the Commission issued for inquiring into it on the 4th of March last, ordered 1350
Reform—Petitions for extending the franchise in Scotland, from Glasgow and other places 1350
Liverpool Election—Petition requesting the House to inquire into the Bribery, at the election if the sitting Member should resign, and prevent legal inquiry 1350
Slavery in the West Indies—Petition from Bristol—Claim for compensation—Indisposition of the Planters to promote emancipation 1352
Tithes (Ireland)—Petition of Roman Catholics, complaining of being compelled to pay Tithes to the Protestant Church .. 1355
Newgate—Recorder of Dublin—Complaints of the persons confined in that Gaol, and of the Recorder being at once a Judge and a Member of Parliament 1356
Duties on Barilla—Animadversions on the Ministers for ordering these Duties to be reduced without the consent of Parliament 1363
Under Secretary for Ireland—Complaint that he was unnecessarily dismissed 1369
Legal Appointments in Ireland—The Ministry attacked for the appointment of a new Lord Chancellor, and for raising Chief Baron O'Grady to the Peerage—Remarks on the effects of the Revolutions in France and Belgium—Difference of Opinion as to Economy and Retrenchment between the late and the present Ministry 1370
Adjournment for the Recess—Business of the House—Explanation of the course proposed by Ministers 1398
Court of Chancery—Adjourned Debate—Sir E. B. Sugden's Plan—Great Expense of this Court—Ruinous effects of a combination of Law and Equity 1399

III. THE KING'S SPEECH.

Nov. 2. On opening the Session 8

IV. THE KING'S MESSAGES.

Nov. 4. In Answer to the Address from the Lords .. *Page* 195
In Answer to the Address from the Commons on opening the Session 200

V. ADDRESSES TO THE KING.

Nov. 2. In Answer to his Majesty's Speech on opening the Session—House of Lords 18
In Answer to his Majesty's Speech on opening the Session—House of Commons 57

VI. LISTS OF DIVISIONS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Nov. 11. LIST of the Minority, in the House of Commons, of twenty-four, on the Motion to Repeal the Sub-letting Act (Ireland) .. 409
12. - - - of the Minority, in the House of Commons, on Sir Henry Parnell's Motion to reduce the Duty on Wheat imported into the West-India Islands 484
15. - - - of the Majority, Minority, and Absentees, in the House of Commons, on the Motion for referring the Civil List to a Committee 549

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

BEING THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE NINTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND,

APPOINTED TO MEET AT WESTMINSTER THE 26TH OF OCTOBER, 1830,

IN THE FIRST YEAR OF THE REIGN OF HIS MAJESTY

WILLIAM THE FOURTH.

(Corrected to the First Day of Meeting.)

Abercromby, hon. G. R.	*Clackmannansh.*
Acheson, visc.	*Armaghshire*
Acland, sir Thos. D., bt.	*Devonshire*
A'Court, Edw. Henry	*Heytesbury*
Adeane, Henry John	*Cambridgeshire*
Agnew, sir Andrew, bt.	*Wigtonshire*
Alexander, James	*Old Sarum*
Alexander, Josias	*Old Sarum*
Althorp, viscount	*Northamptonshire*
Anson, sir George	*Lichfield*
Anson, hon. George	*Yarmouth*
Antrobus, Gibbs Crawf.	*Plympton*
Apsley, lord	*Cirencester*
Arbuthnot, hon. H.	*Kincardineshire*
Arbuthnot, rt. hon. Chas.	*Ashburton*
Arcedeckne, Andrew	*Dunwich*
Archdall, Mervyn	*Fermanaghshire*
Ashley, lord	*Dorchester*
Astell, William	*Bridgewater*
Astley, sir J. Dugdale, bt.	*Wiltshire*
Atkins, John	*Arundel*
Attwood, Matthias	*Boroughbridge*
Baillie, Hugh D.	*Rye*
Baillie, John Evan	*Bristol*
Baillie, John	*Inverness-shire*
Bainbridge, Edward T.	*Taunton*
Baldwin, Charles B.	*Totness*
Balfour, James	*Crail, &c.*
Bankes, George	*Corfe-Castle*
Bankes, Henry	*Dorsetshire*
Bankes, William John	*Marlborough*
Baring, Alexander	*Callington*
Baring, Francis	*Portsmouth*
Baring, Francis	*Thetford*
Baring, sir Thos., bt.	*Wycombe*
Baring, William B.	*Callington*
Barne, Frederick	*Dunwich*
Bastard, John	*Dartmouth*
Bateson, sir Robert	*Londonderryshire*
Bayntun, Samuel A.	*York*
Beaumont, Thomas W.	*Northumberland*
Beckett, rt. hon. sir J. bt.	*Haslemere*
Belfast, earl of	*Antrimshire*
Belgrave, visc.	*Cheshire*
Bell, Matthew	*Northumberland*
Benett, John	*Wiltshire*
Bentinck, lord George	*King's Lynn*
Beresford, lord George	*Waterfordshire*
Beresford, sir J. P. bt.	*Northallerton*
Beresford, Marcus	*Berwick*
Bernal, Ralph	*Rochester*
Bernard, Thomas	*King's County*
Bernard, viscount	*Bandonbridge*
Bethell, Richard	*Yorkshire*
Biddulph, Robert M.	*Denbigh*
Blackett, Christopher	*Beeralston*
Blair, William	*Ayrshire*
Blake, sir Francis, bt.	*Berwick*
Blandford, marquis	*Woodstock*
Blaney, hon. Cadwallader	*Monhagansh.*
Blount, Edward	*Steyning*
Bonham, Francis R.	*Rye*
Borradaile, Richard.	*Newcastle, Staff.*
Bourne, rt. hon. W. Sturg.	*Milborne Port*
Bouverie, hon. Dunc. P.	*New Sarum*
Bouverie, hon. Phillip P.	*Cockermouth*
Boyle, hon. John	*Cork*
Boyle, visct.	*Corkshire*
Brabazon, lord	*Dublinshire*
Bradshaw, Rob. Haldane	*Brackley*
Bradshaw, James	*Brackley*
Briscoe, John I.	*Surrey*
Brogden, James	*Launceston*
Brougham, Henry	*Yorkshire* *Knaresborough*
Brougham, James	*Downton*
Browne, James	*Mayo*
Browne, hon. William	*Kerryshire*
Browne, Dominick	*Mayo*
Brownlow, Charles	*Armaghshire*
Bruce, Michael	*Ilchester*
Brudenel, lord	*Fowey*
Bruen, Henry	*Carlowshire*
Brydges, sir John	*Coleraine*
Buck, Lewis W.	*Exeter*
Buller, Charles, jun.	*West Looe*
Buller, James W.	*Exeter*
Bulwer, Henry L.	*Wilton*

Bunbury, sir Henry E.	*Suffolk*
Burdett, sir F., bt.	*Westminster*
Burke, sir John, bt.	*Galwayshire*
Burton, Henry	*Beverley*
Burrard, George	*Lymington*
Burrell, sir C. M., bt.	*New Shoreham*
Burrell, Walter	*Sussex*
Buxton, John Jacob	*Bedwyn*
Buxton, Thos. Fowell	*Weymouth*
Byng, George	*Middlesex*
Byng, George S.	*Milborne Port*
Calcraft, rt. hon. John	*Wareham*
Callaghan, Daniel	*Cork*
Calthorpe, hon. Fred. G.	*Bramber*
Calvert, John	*Huntingdon*
Calvert, Nicolson	*Hertfordshire*
Campbell, Walter F.	*Argyleshire*
Campbell, Archibald	*Glasgow, &c.*
Campbell, hon. George P.	*Nairnshire*
Campbell, John	*Stafford*
Capel, John	*Queenborough*
Carnegie, sir James, bt.	*Aberdeen, &c.*
Carrington, sir E. C.	*St. Mawes*
Carter, John	*Portsmouth*
Cartwright, Wm. R.	*Northamptonsh.*
Castlereagh, viscount	*Downshire*
Cavendish, lord G. A. H.	*Derbyshire*
Cavendish, Henry F. C.	*Derby*
Cavendish, William	*Cambridge Univers.*
Cawthorne, John F.	*Lancaster*
Cecil, lord Thomas	*Stamford*
Chandos, marquis	*Bucks*
Chaplin, Charles	*Lincolnshire*
Chaplin, Thomas	*Stamford*
Chapman, Montague L.	*Westmeath*
Chichester, Arthur	*Wexfordshire*
Chichester, sir Arthur, bt.	*Belfast*
Cholmeley, Montague J.	*Grantham*
Cholmondeley, lord H.	*Castle Rising*
Churchill, lord Charles S.	*Woodstock*
Clements, John M.	*Leitrimshire*
Clerk, sir Geo., bt.	*Edinburghshire*
Clinton, Clinton, J. F.	*Aldborough*
Clive, Edward B.	*Hereford*
Clive, viscount	*Ludlow*
Clive, Henry	*Montgomery*
Clive, hon. Robert H.	*Ludlow*
Cockburn, rt. hon. sir G.	*Plymouth*
Cockerell, sir Charles, bt.	*Evesham*
Cocks, James	*Reigate*
Coke, Thomas Wm.	*Norfolk*
Colborne, Nich. W. R.	*Horsham*
Cole, hon. Arthur H.	*Enniskillen*
Constable, sir Thos. A. C.	*Hedon*
Cooke, sir Henry F.	*Orford*
Cooper, Edward J.	*Sligoshire*
Coote, sir Chas. H., bt.	*Queen's County*
Coote, Eyre	*Clonmell*
Cornewall, Fred. H.	*Bishop's Castle*
Corry, viscount	*Fermanaghshire*
Corry, hon. Hen. T. L.	*Tyroneshire*
Cotterell, sir J. G., bt.	*Herefordshire*
Courtenay, rt. hon. T. P.	*Totness*
Cradock, Sheldon	*Camelford*
Cradock, hon. John H.	*Dundalk*
Cripps, Joseph	*Cirencester*
Croker, rt. hon. J. W.	*Aldeburgh*
Curteis, Herbert B.	*Sussex*
Curzon, hon. Robert	*Clitheroe*
Cust, hon. Edward	*Lestwithiel*
Cust, hon. Peregrine F.	*Clitheroe*
Dalrymple, sir Adol. J.	*Haddington, &c.*
Darlington, earl	*Saltash*
Davies, Thos. Henry	*Worcester*
Davis, Richard Hart	*Bristol*
Dawson, Alexander	*Louth*
Dawson, George R.	*Harwich*
Denison, Wm. Joseph	*Surrey*
Denman, Thomas	*Nottingham*
Dick, Quintin	*Maldon*
Dickinson, William	*Somersetshire*
Doherty, John	*Newport*
Dottin, Abel R.	*Southampton*
Douglas, Wm. R. K.	*Dumfries, &c.*
Douglas, hon. Charles	*Lanarkshire*
Douro, marquis	*Aldeburgh*
Dowdeswell, John Edm.	*Tewkesbury*
Drake, Thomas T.	*Agmondesham*
Drake, William T.	*Agmondesham*
Drummond, Henry H.	*Stirlingshire*
Duff, hon. Alexander	*Elgin, &c.*
Dugdale, Dugd. Stratf.	*Warwickshire*
Dugdale, William S.	*Shaftesbury*
Duncannon, viscount	*Kilkennyshire*
Duncombe, hon. Arthur	*East Retford*
Duncombe, Thomas S.	*Hertford*
Duncombe, hon. Wm.	*Yorkshire*
Dundas, hon. Henry	*Winchelsea*
Dundas, Robert Adam	*Ipswich*
Dundas, Charles	*Berkshire*
Dundas, hon. Thomas	*York*
Dundas, rt. hon. Wm.	*Edinburgh*
Dundas, hon. sir R. L.	*Richmond*
Dundas, hon. John C.	*Richmond*
Durham, sir Philip C. H.	*Queenborough*
East, sir Edward H. bt.	*Winchester*
Eastnor, viscount	*Hereford*
Ebrington, viscount	*Devonshire* *Tavistock*
Egerton, Wilbraham	*Cheshire*
Egerton, sir Phil. de M. G.	*Chester*
Egerton, William T.	*Lemington*
Eliot, lord	*Liskeard*
Ellice, Edward	*Coventry*
Ellis, hon. G. J. W. A.	*Okehampton*
Ellis, hon. Augustus F.	*Seaford*
Encombe, viscount	*Truro*
Estcourt, Thos. G. B.	*Oxford Univ.*

Estcourt, T. H. S. B.	*Marlborough*
Euston, earl	*Bury St. Edmund's*
Evans, William	*Leicester*
Ewing, James	*Wareham*
Fane, hon. Henry S.	*Lyme Regis*
Fane, John	*Oxfordshire*
Fane, John Thomas	*Lyme Regis*
Fane, sir Henry	*Hastings*
Fardell, John	*Lincoln*
Farrand, Robert	*Hedon*
Ferguson, sir Ronald C.	*Nottingham*
Ferguson, sir Robt. A., bt.	*Londonderry*
Ferguson, Rob. C.	*Kirkcudbright*
Fitzgerald, John	*Seaford*
Fitzgerald, rt. hon. Mau.	*Kerryshire*
Fitzgerald, ld. Wm. C.	*Kildareshire*
Fitzgerald, rt. hon. W. V.	*Lostwithiel*
Fitz-Gibbon, hon. Rd.	*Limerickshire*
Fitzroy, lord Charles	*Thetford*
Fleming, John	*Hampshire*
Foley, Edward T.	*Ludgershall*
Foley, John H. H.	*Droitwich*
Foley, hon. Thomas H.	*Worcestershire*
Folkes, sir W. J. H. B.	*Norfolk*
Forbes, John	*Malmesbury*
Forbes, sir Chas., bt.	*Malmesbury*
Forbes, viscount	*Longfordshire*
Fordwich, lord	*Canterbury*
Forester, hon. G. C. W.	*Wenlock*
Fortescue, hon. Geo. M.	*Hindon*
Frankland, Robert	*Thirsk*
Freemantle, sir Thos., bt.	*Buckingham*
French, Arthur	*Roscommonshire*
Freshfield, James W.	*Penryn*
Fyler, Thomas B.	*Coventry*
Garlies, viscount	*Cockermouth*
Gascoyne, Isaac	*Liverpool*
Gilbert, Davies	*Bodmyn*
Gisborne, John	*Stafford*
Gordon, sir James W.	*Launceston*
Gordon, John	*Weymouth*
Gordon, Robert	*Cricklade*
Gordon, hon. Will.	*Aberdeenshire*
Gordon, James A.	*Tregony*
Gore, William O.	*Carnarvon*
Goulburn, rt. hon. Henry	*Armagh*
Gower, lord F. L.	*Sutherlandshire*
Graham, sir J. R. G.	*Cumberland*
Graham, marquis of	*Cambridge*
Graham, lord Montagu W.	*Dumbartonsh.*
Graham, sir Sanford	*Ludgershall*
Grant, sir Alex. Cray, bt.	*Westbury*
Grant, Robert	*Norwich*
Grant, rt. hon. C.	*Inverness-shire*
Grant, hon. Francis W.	*Elginshire*
Grattan, James	*Wicklowshire*
Greene, Thomas	*Lancaster*
Gregson, John	*Saltash*
Gresley, sir Roger	*Durham*
Greville, hon. sir C. J.	*Warwick*
Grimstone, viscount	*St. Alban's*
Grosvenor, rt. hon. Robt.	*Chester*
Guest, Josiah John	*Honiton*
Guise, sir B. W. bt.	*Gloucestershire*
Gunning, sir Robt. Hen.	*Northampton*
Gurney, Hudson	*Newton, Hants*
Gurney, Richard H.	*Norwich*
Handcock, Richard	*Athlone*
Hardinge, rt. hon. sir H.	*St. Germains*
Harris, George	*Grimsby*
Hart, George Vaughan	*Donegalshire*
Harvey, Daniel W.	*Colchester*
Hastings, sir C. A. bt.	*Leicester*
Hawkins, John H.	*St. Michael*
Hay, lord John	*Haddingtonshire*
Heathcote, sir Gilbert, bt.	*Rutland*
Heathcote, sir W. bt.	*Hampshire*
Heron, sir Robert, bt.	*Peterborough*
Herries, rt. hon. John C.	*Harwich*
Hill, lord Arthur	*Downshire*
Hill, lord George A.	*Carrickfergus*
Hill, sir Rowland, bt.	*Shropshire*
Hobhouse, John Cam.	*Westminster*
Hodges, Thomas L.	*Kent*
Hodgson, John	*Newcastle-upon-Tyne*
Hodson, James Alex.	*Wigan*
Holdsworth, Arthur H.	*Dartmouth*
Holmesdale, visc.	*East Grinstead*
Holmes, William	*Queenborough* *Haslemere*
Hope, hon. sir Alex.	*Linlithgowshire*
Hope, Henry T.	*East Looe*
Hope, John T.	*Gatton*
Hotham, lord	*Leominster*
Houldsworth, Thomas	*New Shoreham*
Howard, Henry	*Newton, Lancashire*
Howard, hon. Fulk G.	*Castle Rising*
Howard, Ralph	*Wicklowshire*
Howard, Philip Henry	*Carlisle*
Howard, hon. William	*Morpeth*
Howick, viscount	*Higham Ferrers*
Hoy, James B.	*Southampton*
Hughes, William Lewis	*Wallingford*
Hughes, William H.	*Oxford*
Hulse, sir Charles, bt.	*West Looe*
Hume, Joseph	*Middlesex*
Jenkins, Richard	*Shrewsbury*
Jephson, C. D. O.	*Mallow*
Jermyn, earl	*Bury St. Edmund's*
Jerningham, hon. Hen. V. S.	*Pontefract*
Ingestre, viscount	*Hertford*
Ingilby, sir W. A., bt.	*Lincolnshire*
Inglis, sir R. H. bt.	*Oxford Univers.*
Johnston, James	*Inverkeithing, &c.*
Johnstone, John J. H.	*Dumfries-shire*
Jolliffe, sir William G. H.	*Petersfield*
Jolliffe, Gilbert E.	*Petersfield*
Jones, John	*Carmarthen*

Jones, Theobald	*Londonderryshire*
Irving, John	*Bramber*
Kavanagh, Thomas	*Carlowshire*
Keck, George A. L.	*Leicestershire*
Kemmis, Thomas A.	*East Looe*
Kemp, Thos. Read	*Lewes*
Kennedy, Thomas Francis	*Ayr, &c.*
Kennedy, lord	*Evesham*
Kenyon, hon. Lloyd	*St. Michael*
Kerrison, sir Edward, bt.	*Eye*
Kilderbee, Spenser H.	*Orford*
Killeen, lord	*Meathshire*
King, hon. Henry	*Sligo*
King, sir John D., bt.	*Wycombe*
King, hon. Robert	*Corkshire*
Knatchbull, sir Edw., bt.	*Kent*
Knight, Robert	*Wallingford*
Knox, hon. John Henry	*Newry*
Knox, hon. Thomas	*Dungannon*
Labouchere, Henry	*Taunton*
Lamb, hon. George	*Dungarvon*
Lambert, James S.	*Galwayshire*
Langston, James H.	*Oxford*
Lascelles, hon. Henry	*Northallerton*
Lauder, Nicholas P.	*Kilkenny*
Lawley, Francis	*Warwickshire*
Lee, John L.	*Wells*
Lefevre, Charles S.	*Downton*
Lefroy, Anthony	*Longfordshire*
Lefroy, Thomas	*Dublin University*
Legh, Thomas	*Newton, Lancashire*
Lemon, sir Charles	*Penryn*
Lennard, Thomas B.	*Maldon*
Lennox, lord John Geo.	*Chichester*
Leslie, Charles P.	*New Ross*
Lester, Benjamin Lester	*Poole*
Lewis, rt. hon. T. F.	*Radnorshire*
Lindsay, James	*Wigan*
Littleton, Edward John	*Staffordshire*
Lloyd, sir Edw. Price, bt.	*Flint*
Loch, James	*Kirkwall, &c.*
Loch, John	*Hythe*
Loughborough, lord	*Dysart, &c.*
Lovaine, lord	*Beeralston*
Lowther, hon. Henry C.	*Westmorland*
Lowther, sir John, bt.	*Cumberland*
Lowther, John Henry	*Wigtown, &c.*
Lowther, viscount	*Westmorland*
Lumley, John S.	*Nottinghamshire*
Lushington, James L.	*Carlisle*
Luttrell, John Fownes	*Minehead*
Lygon, hon. Hen. B.	*Worcestershire*
Maberly, John	*Abingdon*
Macaulay, Thomas B.	*Calne*
Macdonald, sir James, bt.	*Calne*
Mackillop, James	*Tregony*
M'Clintock, John	*Louth*
Mackintosh, rt. hon. sir J.	*Knaresboro'*
Mackinnon, Charles	*Ipswich*
Mackenzie, sir J. W. bt.	*Ross-shire*
Macnamara, William N.	*Clare*
Mahon, Jas. P. O'Gorman	*Clare*
Mahon, visct.	*Wootton Basset*
Maitland, hon. Antony	*Berwickshire*
Maitland, viscount	*Appleby*
Malcolm, Neill	*Boston*
Mandeville, visct.	*Huntingdonshire*
Manners, lord Robert	*Leicestershire*
Marjoribanks, Stewart	*Hythe*
Marryatt, Joseph	*Sandwich*
Marshall, William	*Leominster*
Martin, sir Thomas B.	*Plymouth*
Martin, John	*Tewkesbury*
Maule, hon. William R.	*Forfarshire*
Maxwell, Henry	*Cavan*
Meynell, Henry	*Lisburne*
Milbank, Mark	*Camelford*
Mildmay, Paulet St. John	*Winchester*
Miles, Philip J.	*Corfe-Castle*
Miles, William	*Romney*
Miller, William H.	*Newcastle, Staff.*
Mills, Robert W.	*Blechingly*
Milton, viscount	*Peterborough*
Monteith, Henry	*Selkirk, &c.*
Montgomery, sir James, bt.	*Peebleshire*
Moore, George	*Dublin*
Morgan, sir C., bt.	*Monmouthshire*
Morgan, Charles M. R.	*Brecon*
Morison, John	*Banfshire*
Morrison, James	*St. Ives*
Morpeth, viscount	*Yorkshire*
Mostyn, sir Thomas, bt.	*Flintshire*
Mountcharles, earl	*Donegalshire*
Mundy, Francis	*Derbyshire*
Murray, rt. hon. sir Geo.	*Perthshire*
Neeld, Joseph	*Chippenham*
Newark, lord	*East Retford*
Newport, rt. hon. sir J., bt.	*Waterford*
Norreys, lord	*Oxfordshire*
Nicholl, rt. hon. sir John	*Bedwyn*
Noel, sir Gerard N., bt.	*Rutland*
North, John H.	*Drogheda*
Nugent, sir George, bt.	*Buckingham*
Nugent, lord	*Aylesbury*
O'Brien, William S.	*Ennis*
O'Connell, Daniel	*Waterfordshire*
O'Connor, Owen	*Roscommon*
O'Ferral, Richard M.	*Kildareshire*
Ogle, sir Charles, bt.	*Portarlington*
O'Grady, Standish	*Limerickshire*
O'Hara, James	*Galway*
Ossory, earl of	*Kilkennyshire*
O'Neil, hon. John R. D. B.	*Antrimshire*
Ord, William	*Morpeth*
Osborne, lord F. G.	*Cambridgeshire*
Owen, Hugh O.	*Pembroke*
Owen, sir John, bt.	*Pembrokeshire*
Oxmantown, lord	*King's County*

Palk, sir Lawrence V., bt.	*Ashburton*
Palmer, Charles	*Bath*
Palmer, Charles F.	*Reading*
Palmer, Robert	*Berkshire*
Palmerston, visc.	*Cambr. Univers.*
Parnell, sir Henry, bt.	*Queen's County*
Patten, John W.	*Lancashire*
Peach, Nathaniel Will.	*Truro*
Pearse, John	*Devizes*
Pechell, sir Samuel J. B.	*Hallestone*
Peel, right hon. sir Robt.	*Tamworth*
Peel, William Yates	*Yarmouth*
Pelham, hon. Charles	*Newton, I. of W.*
Pelham, John Cresset	*Shropshire*
Pendarvis, Edw. W. W.	*Cornwall*
Pennefather, Matthew	*Cashel*
Penrhyn, Edward	*Shaftesbury*
Penruddock, John H.	*Wilton*
Perceval, Spencer	*Newport, I. of W.*
Petit, Louis H.	*Ripon*
Phillpotts, John	*Gloucester*
Philips, George Richard	*Steyning*
Philipps, sir Richard, bt.	*Haverfordwest*
Phipps, hon. Edmund	*Scarborough*
Pigott, George G. W.	*St. Mawes*
Pitt, Joseph	*Cricklade*
Planta, Joseph	*Hastings*
Polhill, Frederick	*Bedford*
Pollen, sir John W., bt.	*Andover*
Ponsonby, hon. George	*Youghall*
Ponsonby, hon. Will. F. S.	*Poole*
Portman, Edw. Berkeley	*Dorsetshire*
Powell, W. Edward	*Cardiganshire*
Powlett, lord W. I. F.	*Durham Coun.*
Prendergast, Michael Geo.	*Westbury*
Price, Samuel Grove	*Sandwich*
Price, sir Robert, bt.	*Herefordshire*
Price, Richard	*New Radnor*
Pringle, Alexander	*Selkirkshire*
Pringle, sir Wm. Henry	*Liskeard*
Prittie, hon. Francis A.	*Tipperary*
Pryse, Pryse	*Cardigan*
Pusey, Philip	*Chippenham*
Rae, sir William, bart.	*Bute*
Raine, Jonathan	*Newport, Cornwall*
Ramsbottom, John	*Windsor*
Ramsden, John Charles	*Malton*
Reid, sir John R.	*Dover*
Rice, Thomas Spring	*Limerick*
Rickford, William	*Aylesbury*
Ridley, sir M. W., bt.	*Newcastle-up.-T.*
Robarts, Abraham W.	*Maidstone*
Roberts, Wilson A.	*Bewdley*
Robinson, George R.	*Worcester*
Robinson, sir George, bt.	*Northampton*
Rochfort, Gust.	*Westmeath County*
Rogers, Edward	*Bishop's Castle*
Rose, George P.	*Christchurch*
Rose, rt. hon. sir. Geo. H.	*Christchurch*
Ross, Charles	*St. Germain's*
Rumbold, Charles E.	*Yarmouth*
Russell, Charles	*Reading*
Russell, John	*Kinsale*
Russell, Robert G.	*Thirsk*
Russell, lord William	*Tavistock*
Russell, William	*Durham County*
Ruthven, Edward S.	*Downpatrick*
Ryder, hon. Granville D.	*Tiverton*
St. Paul, sir H. D. Chol. bt.	*Bridport*
Sadler, Michael T.	*Newark*
Sandon, viscount	*Tiverton*
Sanford, Edward A.	*Somersetshire*
Saunderson, Alex.	*Cavan*
Scarlett, sir James	*Malton*
Scott, Henry F.	*Roxburghshire*
Scott, Samuel	*Whitchurch*
Schonswar, George	*Hull*
Sebright, sir J. S., bart.	*Hertfordshire*
Sefton, earl of	*Droitwitch*
Seymour, lord	*Okehampton*
Seymour, Horace B.	*Bodmyn*
Severn, John C.	*Fowey*
Shaw, Frederick	*Dublin*
Shelley, sir John, bart.	*Lewes*
Shelley, John V.	*Gatton*
Shirley, Evelyn J.	*Monaghanshire*
Sibthorp, Charles	*Lincoln*
Sidney, sir Phillip C.	*Eye*
Slaney, Robert A.	*Shrewsbury*
Smith, Abel	*Wendover*
Smith, George	*Midhurst*
Smith, John Abel	*Midhurst*
Smith, John	*Chichester*
Smith, sir Culling E.	*Pontefract*
Smith, hon. Rob. J.	*Bucks*
Smith, Robert V.	*Tralee*
Smith, Samuel	*Wendover*
Smith, Thos. Assheton	*Andover*
Somerset, lord G. C. H.	*Monmouthsh.*
Somerset, ld. Rob. E. H.	*Gloucestersh.*
Somerville, sir Març. bt.	*Meathshire*
Sotheron, Frank	*Nottinghamshire*
Spence, George	*Ripon*
Spottiswoode, Andrew	*Colchester*
Stanley, lord	*Lancashire*
Stanley, hon. Edw. G. S.	*Preston*
Stanley, William S.	*Stockbridge*
Staunton, sir George T.	*Heytesbury*
Stephens, Stephens L.	*Barnstaple*
Stewart, sir Mich. S. bt.	*Renfrewsh.*
Stewart, sir Hugh, bt.	*Tyroneshire*
Stormont, viscount	*Aldborough*
Strathaven, lord	*Huntingdonshire*
Strutt, Edward	*Derby*
Stuart, Henry V.	*Banbury*
Stuart, James	*Huntingdon*
Stuart, William	*Bedfordshire*
Stuart, lord Dudley C.	*Arundel*

Stuart, ld. Pat. J. H. E.	*Cardiff*
Sugden, sir Edward B.	*Weymouth*
Sumner, George H.	*Guildford*
Surrey, earl of	*Horsham*
Sutton, rt. hon. C. M.	*Scarborough*
Sykes, Daniel	*Beverley*
Talbot, Christ., R. M.	*Glamorganshire*
Tavistock, marquis of	*Bedfordshire*
Taylor, George Watson	*Devizes*
Taylor, Mich. Angelo	*Durham City*
Tennant, Charles	*St. Alban's*
Tennyson, Charles	*Blechingly*
Thompson, George L.	*Yarmouth*
Thompson, Paul B.	*Wenlock*
Thompson, William	*London*
Thomson, Charles P.	*Dover*
Thynne, lord Henry	*Weobly*
Thynne, lord John	*Bath*
Thynne, lord William	*Weobly*
Tomes, John	*Warwick*
Tomline, William Edw.	*Minehead*
Townshend, hon. J. R.	*Whitchurch*
Townshend, lord Chas. F.	*Tamworth*
Townshend, lord J. N. B.	*Halleston*
Trail, George	*Orkney, &c.*
Trench, Fred. William	*Cambridge*
Trevor, hon. Geo. Rice	*Carmarthensh.*
Trevor, hon. Arthur	*Romney*
Tufton, hon. H.	*Appleby*
Tudor, George	*Barnstaple*
Tullamore, lord	*Carlow*
Tunno, Edward R.	*Bossiney*
Twiss, Horace	*Newport, Isle of W.*
Tynte, Chas. Kemys	*Bridgewater*
Tyrell, Charles	*Suffolk*
Tyrrell, John T.	*Essex*
Ure, Masterton	*Weymouth*
Uxbridge, earl of	*Anglesey*
Valletort, viscount	*Plympton*
Vaughan, sir R. W. bt.	*Merionethsh.*
Valentia, viscount	*Wexfordshire*
Vaughan, John E.	*Wells*
Vere, James J. Hope	*Ilchester*
Vernon, Geo. Granv. V.	*Lichfield*
Villiers, Thomas H.	*Wootton Bassett*
Villiers, viscount	*Rochester*
Vivian, sir R. Hussey, bt.	*Windsor*
Vyvyan, sir Rd. Rawl. bt.	*Cornwall*
Waithman, Robert	*London*
Wall, Charles Baring	*Guildford*
Walpole, hon. John	*King's Lynn*
Walrond, Bethel	*Sudbury*
Wandesford, hon. C. B. C. S.	*Kilkennysh.*
Walsh, sir John	*Sudbury*
Warburton, Henry	*Bridport*
Ward, William	*London*
Warrender, rt. hn. sir G. bt.	*Honiton*
Watson, hon. Richard	*Canterbury*
Webb, Edward	*Gloucester*
Welby, Glynne E.	*Grantham*
Wellesley, hon. Will. P. T. L.	*St. Ives*
Wemyss, James	*Fife*
West, Frederick R.	*East Grinstead*
Western, Charles Callis	*Essex*
Wetherell, sir Chas.	*Boroughbridge*
Weyland, John	*Hindon*
Whitbread, Wm. Henry	*Bedford*
White, Henry	*Dublinshire*
White, Samuel	*Leitrimshire*
Whitmore, Thomas	*Bridgenorth*
Whitmore, Will. Wolr.	*Bridgenorth*
Wigram, William	*Wexford*
Wilbraham, George	*Stockbridge*
Wilks, John	*Boston*
Williams, John	*Winchelsea*
Williams, Owen	*Marlow*
Williams, sir Rob., bt.	*Beaumaris*
Williams, Robert	*Dorchester*
Williams, Thomas Peers	*Marlow*
Willoughby, Henry	*Newark*
Wilson, sir Robert T.	*Southwark*
Winchester, Henry	*Maidstone*
Wood, Charles	*Grimsby*
Wood, John	*Preston*
Wood, Matthew	*London*
Wood, Thomas	*Breconshire*
Worcester, marquis of	*Monmouth*
Wortley, hon. Charles S.	*Bossiney*
Wortley, hon. John S.	*Forfar, &c.*
Wrightson, William B.	*Hull*
Wrottesley, sir J., bt.	*Staffordshire*
Wyndham, Wadham	*New Sarum*
Wynne, Charles W. G.	*Carnarvonshire*
Wynne, John	*Sligo*
Wynn, rt. hn. C. W. W.	*Montgomerysh.*
Wynn, sir Watkin Wm., bt.	*Denbighsh.*
Wyse, Thomas	*Tipperary*
Yorke, sir Joseph Sydney	*Reigate*

SPEAKER,

The Right Hon. Charles Manners Sutton.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER OF COUNTIES, BOROUGHS, &c.

Double Returns are marked thus || ||

ENGLAND AND WALES.

Abingdon.
John Maberly.

Agmondesham.
T. T. Drake,
W. T. Drake.

Alban's, St.
Viscount Grimston,
Charles Tennant.

Aldborough.
C. J. Fynes Clinton,
Viscount Stormont.

Aldeburgh.
Marquis of Douro,
John Wilson Croker.

Andover.
Sir John W. Pollen, bart.
T. A. Smith.

Anglesey.
Earl of Uxbridge.

Appleby.
Hon. Henry Tufton,
Viscount Maitland.

Arundel.
John Atkins,
Lord D. Coutts Stuart.

Ashburton.
Sir L. V. Palk, bart.
Hon. C. Arbuthnot.

Aylesbury.
Lord Nugent,
William Rickford.

Banbury.
Henry Villiers Stuart.

Barnstaple.
Stephens Lyne Stephens,
George Tudor.

Bath.
Lord John Thynne,
Charles Palmer.

Beaumaris.
Sir Robert Williams, bart.

Bedfordshire.
Marquis of Tavistock,
William Stuart.

Bedford.
William Henry Whitbread,
Frederick Polhill.

Great Bedwin.
Rt. hon. sir J. Nicholl,
John Jacob Buxton.

Beeralston.
Lord Lovaine,
Christopher Blackett.

Berkshire.
Charles Dundas,
Robert Palmer.

Berwick.
Marcus Beresford,
Sir Francis Blake, bart.

Beverley.
Henry Burton,
Daniel Sykes.

Bewdley.
Wilson A. Roberts.

Bishop's Castle.
Edward Rogers,
Frederick H. Cornewall.

Blechingly.
Charles Tennyson,
Robert William Mills.

Bodmyn.
Davies Gilbert,
Horace B. Seymour.

Boroughbridge.
Sir Charles Wetherell,
Matthias Attwood.

Bossiney.
Hon. Chas. Stuart Wortley,
Edward Rose Tunno.

Boston.
Neill Malcolm,
John Wilks.

Brackley.
R. Haldane Bradshaw,
James Bradshaw.

Bramber.
John Irving,
Hon. Fred. G. Calthorpe.

Breconshire.
Thomas Wood.

Brecon.
C. M. Robinson Morgan.

Bridgenorth.
Thomas Whitmore,
Will. Wolryche Whitmore.

Bridgewater.
William Astell,
Chas. Kemeys K. Tynte.

Bridport.
Sir H. D. C. St. Paul, bt.
Henry Warburton.

Bristol.
Rich. Hart Davis,
John Evan Baillie.

Buckinghamshire.
Marquis of Chandos,
Hon. Robert J. Smith.

Buckingham.
Sir George Nugent, bart.
Sir Thos. F. Fremantle, bt.

Callington.
Alexander Baring,
William Bingham Baring.

Calne.
Sir James Macdonald, bart.
Thos. Babington Macaulay.

Cambridgeshire.
Rt. hon. lord F. G. Osborne,
Henry John Adeane.

Cambridge University.
Viscount Palmerston,
William Cavendish.

Cambridge, Borough.
Marquis of Graham,
Fred. Wm. Trench.

Camelford.
Mark Milbank,
Sheldon Cradock.

Canterbury.
Hon. Richard Watson.
Viscount Fordwich.

Cardiff.
Lord P. J. H. C. Stewart.

Cardiganshire.
William Edward Powell.

Cardigan.
Pryse Pryse.

Carlisle.
James Law Lushington,
Philip Henry Howard.

Carmarthenshire.
Hon. G. R. Rice Trevor.

Carmarthen.
John Jones.

Carnarvonshire.
C. Wynne Griffith Wynne.

Carnarvon.
William Ormsby Gore.

Castle Rising.
Lord H. Cholmondeley,
Hon. F. Grev. Howard.

Cheshire.
Wilbraham Egerton,
Viscount Belgrave.

Chester.
Hon. Robert Grosvenor,
Sir P. de M. G. Egerton, bt.

Chichester.
Lord J. Geo. Lennox,
John Smith.

Chippenham.
Joseph Neeld,
Philip Pusey.

Christchurch.
Rt. hon. sir G. H. Rose,
George Pitt Rose.

Cirencester.
Lord Apsley,
Joseph Cripps.

Clitheroe.
Hon. Robert Curzon,
Hon. P. F. Cust.

Cockermouth.
Viscount Garlies,
Hon. P. Pleydell Bouverie.

Colchester.
Andrew Spottiswoode,
Daniel Whittle Harvey.

Corfe-Castle.
George Bankes,
Philip John Miles.

Cornwall.
Sir R. Raw. Vyvyan, bt.
E. W. W. Pendarvis.

Coventry.
Thomas Bilcliffe Fyler,
Edward Ellice.

Cricklade.
Joseph Pitt,
Robert Gordon.

Cumberland.
Sir John Lowther, bart.
Sir J. R. G. Graham, bart.

Dartmouth.
John Bastard,
Arthur Howe Holdsworth.

Denbighshire.
Sir W. W. Wynn, bart.

Denbigh.
Robt. Myddleton Biddulph.

Derbyshire.
Lord G. A. H. Cavendish,
Francis Mundy.

Derby.
Hen. Fred. C. Cavendish,
Edward Strutt.

Devizes.
John Pearse,
George Watson Taylor.

Devonshire.
Sir Thos. D. Acland, bart.
Viscount Ebrington.

Dorchester.
Robert Williams,
Lord Ashley.

Dorsetshire.
Henry Bankes,
Edw. Berkeley Portman.

Dover.
Chas. Poulett Thomson,
Sir John Rae Reid, bart.

Downton.
James Brougham,
Charles Shaw Lefevre.

Droitwich.
Earl of Sefton,
John Hodgetts H. Foley.

Dunwich.
Andrew Arcedeckne,
Frederick Barne.

Durham, County.
Lord W. J. F. Powlett,
William Russell.

Durham.
Michael Angelo Taylor,
Sir Roger Gresley, bart.

East Looe.
Henry T. Hope,
Thomas Arthur Kemmis.

East Retford.
Viscount Newark,
Hon. Arthur Duncombe.

Edmund's, Bury St.
Earl of Euston,
Earl Jermyn.

Essex.
Charles Callis Western,
John Tyssen Tyrell.

Evesham.
Sir Charles Cockerell, bt.
Lord Kennedy.

Exeter.
Lewis William Buck,
James Wentworth Buller.

Eye.
Sir Edward Kerrison, bt.
Sir Philip Charles Sidney.

Flintshire.
Sir Thomas Mostyn, bart.

Flint.
Sir Edw. Price Lloyd, bart.

Fowey.
Lord Brudenell,
John Cheesment Severn.

Gatton.
John Villiers Shelley,
John Thomas Hope.

St. Germain's,
Charles Ross,
Sir Henry Hardinge.

Glamorganshire.
C. Rice Mansel Talbot.

Gloucestershire.
Lord R. E. H. Somerset,
Sir Berk. Will. Guise, bart.

Gloucester.
Edward Webb,
John Phillpotts.

Grantham.
Glynne Earle Welby,
Montague John Cholmeley.

Great Grimsby.
Charles Wood,
George Harris.

East Grinstead.
Viscount Holmsdale,
Frederick Richard West.

Guildford.
Charles Baring Wall,
George Holme Sumner.

Halleston.
Lord J. N. B. B. Townshend,
Sir S. John B. Pechell, bt.

Hampshire.
John Fleming,
Sir Will. Heathcote, bart.

Harwich.
Rt. hon. John C. Herries,
Rt. hon. G. Robt. Dawson.

Haslemere.
Rt. hon. sir J. Beckett, bt.
William Holmes.

Hastings.
Sir Henry Fane,
Joseph Planta.

Haverfordwest.
Sir Richard B. Philipps, bt.

Hedon.
Sir T. A. C. Constable, bt.
Robert Farrand.

Herefordshire.
Sir J. Geers Cotterell, bart.
Sir Robert Price, bart.

Hereford.
Viscount Eastnor,
Edward Bolton Clive.

Hertfordshire.
Sir John S. Sebright,
Nicolson Calvert.

Hertford.
Thomas S. Duncombe,
Viscount Ingestre.

Heytesbury.
Edward Henry A'Court,
Sir Geo. Thos. Staunton, bt.

Higham-Ferrers.
Viscount Howick.

Hindon.
John Weyland,
Hon. Geo. M. Fortescue.

Honiton.
Josiah John Guest,
Sir George Warrender, bt.

Horsham.
Nich. Will. Ridley Colborne,
Earl of Surrey.

Huntingdonshire.
Viscount Mandeville,
Lord Strathaven.

Huntingdon.
John Calvert,
James Stuart.

Hythe.
Stewart Marjoribanks,
John Loch.

Ipswich.
Charles Mackinnon,
Robert Adam Dundas.

Ivelchester.
Michael Bruce,
Jas. Joseph Hope-Vere.

Ives, St.
Hon. W. P. T. L. Wellesley,
James Morrison.

Kent.
Sir Edw. Knatchbull, bart.
Thomas Law Hodges.

King's Lynn.
Lord G. F. C. Bentinck,
Hon. John Walpole.

Kingston-upon-Hull.
George Schonswar,
Wm. Battie Wrightson.

Knaresborough.
Rt. hon. sir J. Mackintosh,
Henry Brougham.

Lancashire.
Lord Stanley,
John Wilson Patten.

Lancaster.
John Fenton Cawthorne,
Thomas Greene.

Launceston.
James Brogden,
Sir James W. Gordon.

Leicestershire.
Lord Rob. Manners,
George Ant. Legh Keck.

Leicester.
Sir Chas. A. Hastings, bart.
William Evans.

Leominster.
Lord Hotham,
William Marshall.

Lewes.
Thomas Read Kemp,
Sir John Shelley, bart.

Lincolnshire.
Charles Chaplin.
Sir W. Am. Ingleby, bart.

Lincoln.
Chas. D. W. Sibthorp,
John Fardell.

Liskeard.
Lord Eliot,
Sir William Henry Pringle.

Lichfield.
Sir George Anson,
George Granv. V. Vernon.

Liverpool.
Isaac Gascoyne,

London.
William Thompson,
Robert Waithman,
William Ward,
Matthew Wood.

Lostwithiel.
Rt. hn. W. F. V. Fitzgerald,
Hon. Edward Cust.

Ludgershall.
Sir Sandford Graham, bt.
Edward Thos. Foley.

Ludlow.
Viscount Clive,
Hon. Robert Henry Clive.

Lyme Regis.
Hon. Henry Sutton Fane,
John Thomas Fane.

Lymington.
George Burrard,
William Tatton Egerton.

Maidstone.
Abraham Wildey Robarts,
Henry Winchester.

Maldon.
Thomas Barrett Lennard,
Quintin Dick.

Malmesbury.
Sir Charles Forbes, bart.
John Forbes.

Malton.
John Charles Ramsden,
Sir James Scarlett.

Marlborough.
Thos. Hen. S. B. Estcourt,
William John Bankes.

Great Marlow.
Owen Williams,
Thomas Peers Williams.

Mawes, St.
Sir C. E. Carrington,
G. Grenville W. Pigott.

Merionethshire.
Sir Rob. W. Vaughan, bt.

Michael, St.
Hon. Lloyd Kenyon,
John Heywood Hawkins.

Middlesex.
George Byng,
Joseph Hume.

Midhurst.
George Smith.
John Abel Smith,

Milborne-Port.
George Stevens Byng,
Rt. hon. W. Sturges Bourne.

Minehead.
John Fownes Luttrell,
Wm. Edward Tomline.

Monmouthshire.
Sir Charles Morgan, bart.
Lord G. C. H. Somerset.

Monmouth.
Marquis of Worcester.

Montgomeryshire.
Rt. hon. C. W. W. Wynn.

Montgomery.
Henry Clive.

Morpeth.
William Ord,
Hon. William Howard.

Newark.
Henry Willoughby,
Michael Thomas Sadler.

Newcastle-under-Line.
Richardson Borradaile,
William Henry Miller.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Sir M. W. Ridley, bart.
John Hodgson.

Newport, Cornwall.
Jonathan Raine,
John Doherty.

Newport, Isle of W.
Spencer Perceval,
Horace Twiss.

Newton, Lancashire.
Thomas Legh,
Thomas Houldsworth.

Newton, Hants.
Hudson Gurney,
Hon. C. A. Worsley Pelham.

Norfolk.
Thomas William Coke,
Sir W. J. H. B. Folkes, bt.

Northallerton.
Hon. Henry Lascelles,
Sir John P. Beresford, bart.

Northamptonshire.
Wm. Ralph Cartwright,
Viscount Althorp.

Northampton.
Sir G. Robinson, bart.
Sir Robt. H. Gunning, bt.

Northumberland.
Matthew Bell,
T. Wentworth Beaumont.

Norwich.
Richard Hanbury Gurney,
Robert Grant.

Nottinghamshire.
Frank Sotheron,
John Saville Lumley.

Nottingham.
Thomas Denman.
Sir R. Crawford Ferguson.

Okehampton.
Lord Seymour,
Rt. hon. G. J. W. Agar Ellis.

Orford.
Sir Henry Fred. Cooke,
Spencer Henry Kilderbee.

Oxfordshire.
John Fane,
Lord Norreys.

Oxford.
Jas. Haughton Langston,
Wm. Hughes Hughes.

Oxford University.
Thomas G. B. Estcourt,
Sir Robert Harry Inglis, bt.

Pembrokeshire.
Sir John Owen, bart.

Pembroke.
Hugh Owen Owen.

Penryn.
Sir Charles Lemon, bt.
Jas. Wm. Freshfield.

Peterborough.
Sir Robert Heron, bart.
Viscount Milton.

Petersfield.
Sir W. G. Hylt. Jolliffe, bt.
Gilbert East Jolliffe.

Plymouth.
Rt. hon. sir G. Cockburn,
Sir Thos. B. Martin, bart.

Plympton-Earle.
Gibbs Crawfurd Antrobus,
Viscount Valletort.

Pontefract.
Sir C. Eardley Smith, bt.
Hon. Hen. V. S. Jerningham.

Poole.
Benjamin Lester Lester,
Hon. W. F. S. Ponsonby.

Portsmouth.
John Bonham Carter,
Francis Thornhill Baring.

Preston.
Hon. E. G. S. Stanley,
John Wood.

Queenborough. || ||
William Holmes,
John Capel,
Sir P. C. H. Durham, bt.

Radnorshire.
Rt. hon. Thomas F. Lewis.

Radnor.
Richard Price.

Reading.
Charles Fyshe Palmer,
Charles Russell.

Richmond.
Hon. sir R. L. Dundas,
Hon. John C. Dundas.

Ripon.
Louis Hayes Petit,
George Spence.

Rochester.
Ralph Bernal,
Viscount Villiers.

Romney.
Hon. Arthur Trevor,
William Miles.

Rutland.
Sir Gerard Noel Noel, bt.
Sir Gilbert Heathcote, bt.

Rye.
Hugh Duncan Baillie,
Francis Robert Bonham.

Ryegate.
Sir Joseph Sidney Yorke,
James Cocks.

Salop.
Sir Rowland Hill, bart.
John Cressett Pelham.

Saltash.
Earl of Darlington,
John Gregson.

Sandwich.
Joseph Marryatt.
Samuel Grove Price.

Sarum, New.
Wadham Wyndham,
Hon. D. Pleydell-Bouverie.

Sarum, Old.
James Alexander,
Josias Du Pre Alexander.

Scarborough.
Rt. hon. Chas. M. Sutton,
Hon. Edmund Phipps.

Seaford.
John Fitzgerald,
Hon. Augustus Fred. Ellis.

Shaftesbury.
Edward Penrhyn,
Wm. Stratford Dugdale.

Shoreham.
Sir Chas. M. Burrell, bt.
Henry Howard.

Shrewsbury.
Richard Jenkins,
Robert Aglionby Slaney.

Somersetshire.
William Dickinson,
Edw. Ayshford Sanford.

Southampton.
Abel Rous Dottin,
James Barlow Hoy.

Southwark.
Sir Robert Thos. Wilson,

Staffordshire.
Edward John Littleton,
Sir John Wrottesley, bart.

Stafford.
Thomas Gisborne,
John Campbell.

Stamford.
Lord Thomas Cecil,
Thomas Chaplin.

Steyning.
George Richard Philips,
Edward Blount.

Stockbridge.
George Wilbraham,
William Sloane Stanley.

Sudbury.
Bethel Walrond,
Sir John Walsh, bt.

Suffolk.
Sir Hen. Edw. Bunbury, bt.
Charles Tyrell.

Surrey.
William Joseph Denison,
John Ivatt Briscoe.

Sussex.
Walter Burrell,
Herbert Barrett Curteis.

Tamworth.
Lord C. V. Townshend,
Sir Robert Peel, bart.

Tavistock.
Lord Wm. Russell,
Viscount Ebrington.

Taunton.
Henry Labouchere,
Edw. Thos. Bainbridge.

Tewkesbury.
John Edm. Dowdeswell,
John Martin.

Thetford.
Rt. hon. Lord C. Fitzroy,
Francis Baring.

Thirsk.
Robert Frankland,
Robt. Greenhill Russell.

Tiverton.
Viscount Sandon,
Hon. Granv. Dudley Ryder.

Totness.
Rt. hn. Thos. P. Courtenay,
Charles Barry Baldwin.

Tregony.
James Adam Gordon,
James Mackillop.

Truro.
Viscount Encombe,
Nathaniel William Peach.

Wallingford.
William Lewis Hughes,
Robert Knight.

Wareham.
Rt. hon. John Calcraft,
James Ewing. *

Warwickshire.
Dugdale Strat. Dugdale,
Francis Lawley.

Warwick.
Hon. sir Chas. J. Greville,
John Tomes.

Wells.
John Edwards Vaughan,
John Lee Lee.

Wendover.
Sam. Smith,—Abel Smith.

Wenlock.
Paul Beilby Thompson,
Hon. G. C. Weld Forrester.

Weobly.
Lord W. Thynne,
Lord H. F. Thynne.

Westbury.
Sir Alex. Cray Grant, bt.
Michael Geo. Prendergast.

West Looe.
Sir Charles Hulse, bart.
Charles Buller.

Westminster.
Sir Francis Burdett, bart.
John Cam Hobhouse.

Westmorland.
Viscount Lowther,
Hon. Hen. Cecil Lowther.

Weymouth & Melcombe Regis.
Masterton Ure,
Thos. Fowell Buxton,
John Gordon,
Sir Edw. B. Sugden.

Whitchurch.
Samuel Scott,
Hon. John R. Townshend.

Wigan.
James Alex. Hodson,
James Lindsay.

Wilton.
John Hung. Penruddocke,
Henry Lytton Bulwer.

Wiltshire.
John Benett,
Sir John Dugd. Astley, bt.

Winchelsea.
John Williams,
Hon. Henry Dundas.

Winchester.
Paulet St. John Mildmay,
Sir Edward Hyde East, bt.

Windsor.
John Ramsbottom,
Sir Rich. Hussey Vivian, bt.

Woodstock.
Marquis of Blandford,
Hon. lord C. S. Churchill.

Wootton-Bassett.
Thomas Hyde Villiers,
Viscount Mahon.

Worcestershire.
Hon. Henry B. Lygon,
Hon. Thomas Hen. Foley.

Worcester.
Thomas Henry H. Davies,
George Richard Robinson.

Wycombe.
Sir John D. King, bart.
Sir Thomas Baring, bart.

Yarmouth.
Hon. George Anson,
Charles Edmund Rumbold.

Yarmouth, Hants.
William Yates Peel,
Geo. Lowther Thompson.

Yorkshire.
Viscount Morpeth,
Henry Brougham,
Hon. William Duncombe,
Richard Bethell,

York.
Samuel Adlam Bayntun,
Hon. Thomas Dundas.

SCOTLAND.

Aberdeenshire.
Hon. William Gordon.

Aberdeen, &c.
Sir James Carnegie, bt.

Argyleshire.
Walter Fred. Campbell.

Ayrshire.
William Blair.

Ayr, &c.
Thos. Fras. Kennedy.

Banfshire.
John Morison.

Berwickshire.
Hon. Anthony Maitland.

Caithness and Bute.
Sir William Rae, bart.

Crail, &c.
James Balfour.

Cromarty and Nairn.
Hon. Geo. Pryse Campbell.

Dumbartonshire.
Lord Mont. Wm. Graham.

Dumfries-shire.
John Jas. Hope Johnstone.

Dumfries, &c.
William Rob. K. Douglas.

Dysart, &c.
Lord Loughborough.

Edinburghshire.
*Sir George Clerk, bart.

Edinburgh.
Right hon. Will. Dundas.

Elginshire.
Hon. Francis Will. Grant.

Elgin, &c.
Hon. Alexander Duff.

Fifeshire.
James Wemyss.

Forfarshire.
Hon. Will. Ramsay Maule.

Forfar, &c.
Hon. John Stuart Wortley.

Fortrose, &c.
John Baillie.

Glasgow, &c.
Archibald Campbell.

Haddingtonshire.
Lord John Hay.

Haddington, &c.
Sir Adol. J. Dalrymple, bt.

Inverkeithing, &c.
James Johnston.

Inverness-shire.
Right hon. Charles Grant.

Kincardineshire.
Hon. Hugh Arbuthnot.

KINROSS and CLACKMANNANSHIRE.
Hon. Geo. R. Abercromby.

KIRKCUDBRIGHT.
Robert Cutlar Ferguson.

KIRKWALL, &c.
James Loch.

LANARKSHIRE.
Hon. Charles Douglas.

LINLITHGOWSHIRE.
Hon. sir Alexander Hope.

ORKNEY and SHETLANDSHIRES.
George Trail.

PEEBLESHIRE.
Sir Jas. Montgomery, bart.

PERTHSHIRE.
Rt. hon. sir George Murray.

RENFREWSHIRE.
Sir Michael S. Stewart, bt.

ROSS-SHIRE.
Sir J. W. Mackenzie.

ROXBURGHSHIRE.
Henry Francis Scott, jun.

SELKIRKSHIRE.
Alexander Pringle.

SELKIRK, &c.
Henry Monteith.

STIRLINGSHIRE.
Henry Home Drummond.

SUTHERLANDSHIRE.
Rt. hon. lord F. L. Gower. *

WIGTONSHIRE.
Sir Andrew Agnew, bart.

WIGTON, &c.
John H. Lowther.

IRELAND.

ANTRIMSHIRE.
Hon. John R. B. O'Neil,
Earl of Belfast.

ARMAGHSHIRE.
Charles Brownlow,
Viscount Acheson.

ARMAGH, BOROUGH.
Rt. hon. Henry Goulburn.

ATHLONE.
Richard Handcock, jun.

BANDON-BRIDGE.
Viscount Bernard.

BELFAST.
Sir Arthur Chichester, bt.

CARLOWSHIRE.
Henry Bruen,
Thomas Kavanagh.

CARLOW.
Lord Tullamore.

CARRICKFERGUS.
Lord Geo. Augusta Hill.

CASHELL.
Matthew Pennefather.

CAVANSHIRE.
Henry Maxwell,
Alexander Saunderson.

CLARE.
Wm. Nugent M'Namara,
J. Pat. O'Gorman Mahon.

CLONMEL.
Eyre Coote.

COLERAINE.
Sir John Will. H. Brydges.

CORKSHIRE.
Viscount Boyle,
Hon. Robert King.

CORK, CITY.
Hon. John Boyle,
Daniel Callaghan.

DONEGALSHIRE.
George Vaughan Hart,
Earl of Mountcharles.

DOWNSHIRE.
Lord Arthur Hill,
Viscount Castlereagh.

DOWNPATRICK.
Edw. Southwell Ruthven.

DROGHEDA.
John Henry North.

DUBLINSHIRE.
Lord Brabazon,
Henry White.

DUBLIN, CITY.
George Moore,
Frederick Shaw.

DUBLIN, UNIVERSITY.
Thomas Lefroy.

DUNDALK.
Hon. J. Hobart Cradock.

DUNGANNON.
Hon. Thomas Knox.

DUNGARVON.
Hon. George Lamb.

ENNIS.
William Smyth O'Brien.

ENNISKILLEN.
Hon. Arthur Henry Cole.

FERMANAGHSHIRE.
Mervyn Archdall,
Viscount Corry.

GALWAYSHIRE.
James Staunton Lambert,
Sir John Burke, bt.

GALWAY.
James O'Hara.

KERRYSHIRE.
Rt hon. Mau. Fitzgerald,
Hon. William Browne.

KILDARESHIRE.
Lord W. C. Fitzgerald,
Richard More O'Ferrall.

KILKENNYSHIRE.
Viscount Duncannon,
Earl of Ossory.

KILKENNY.
Nicholas Philpot Leader.

KING'S COUNTY.
Thomas Bernard,
Lord Oxmantown.

KINSALE.
John Russell.

LEITRIM.
John Marcus Clements,
Samuel White.

LIMERICK.
Hon. Rich. H. Fitzgibbon,
Standish O'Grady.

LIMERICK, CITY.
Thomas Spring Rice.

LISBURNE.
Henry Meynell.

LONDONDERRY.
Sir Robert Bateson, bart.
Theobald Jones.

LONDONDERRY, CITY.
Sir R. Alex. Ferguson, bt.

LONGFORDSHIRE.
Rt. hon. viscount Forbes.
Anthony Lefroy.

LOUTHSHIRE.
Alexander Dawson,
John M'Clintock.

MALLOW.
Charles D. O. Jephson.

MAYO.
Dominick Browne,
James Browne.

MEATHSHIRE.
Sir Marcus Somerville, bt.
Lord Killeen.

MONAGHAN.
Evelyn John Shirley,
Hon. Cadw. Davis Blayney.

NEWRY.
Hon. John Henry Knox.

PORTARLINGTON.
Sir Charles Ogle, bart.

QUEEN'S COUNTY.
Sir Chas. Henry Coote, bt.
Sir Henry Parnell, bart.

ROSCOMMONSHIRE.
Arthur French,
Owen O'Connor.

NEW ROSS, TOWN.
Charles Powell Leslie.

SLIGOSHIRE.
Hon. Henry King,
Edward Joshua Cooper.

SLIGO.
John Wynne.

TIPPERARY.
Hon. Francis A. Prittie,
Thomas Wyse.

TRALEE.
Robert Vernon Smith.

TYRONESHIRE.
Hon. H. T. Lowry Corry,
Sir Hugh Stewart, bt.

WATERFORD.
Rt.hon. lord G.T.Beresford.
Daniel O'Connell.

WATERFORD, CITY.
Rt. hon. sir J. Newport, bt.

WESTMEATH.
Gustavus Rochfort,
Montag.Lowther Chapman.

WEXFORDSHIRE.
Arthur Chichester,
Viscount Valentia.

WEXFORD.
William Wigram.

WICKLOW.
James Grattan.
Ralph Howard.

YOUGHALL.
Hon. George Ponsonby.

The NUMBER of MEMBERS sent by each County, &c. to Parliament.

Bedfordshire	4	Kent	10	Suffolk	16
Berkshire	9	Lancashire	14	Surrey	14
Buckinghamshire	14	Leicestershire	4	Sussex	20
Cambridgeshire	6	Lincolnshire	12	Warwickshire	6
Cheshire	4	Middlesex	8	Westmoreland	4
Cornwall	42	Monmouthshire	3	Wiltshire	34
Cumberland	6	Norfolk	12	Worcestershire	9
Derbyshire	4	Northamptonshire	9	Yorkshire	32
Devonshire	26	Northumberland	8		
Dorsetshire	20	Nottinghamshire	8		473
Durham	4	Oxfordshire	9	Cinque Ports	16
Essex	8	Rutlandshire	2	Wales	24
Gloucestershire	8	Shropshire	12	Scotland	45
Herefordshire	8	Somersetshire	18	Ireland	100
Hertfordshire	6	Hampshire	26		
Huntingdonshire	4	Staffordshire	10	Total	658

Members for ENGLAND and WALES	513
SCOTLAND	45
IRELAND	100
TOTAL	658

CHIEF OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE.

Chief Clerk, JOHN HENRY LEY, Esq.

Clerk Assistant, JOHN RICKMAN, Esq.

Second Ditto, WILLIAM LEY, Esq.

Clerk of Committees of Privileges and Elections, THOMAS DYSON, Esq.

Prin. Com. Clks., SIR E. STRACEY, Bart. SAMUEL GUNNELL, and WILLIAM G. ROSE, Esqrs.

Clerk of the Journals and Papers, JOHN BULL, Esq.

Clerks of the Ingrossments, SIR EDWARD STRACEY, Bart., and Mr. WILLIAM GUNNELL.

Serjeant at Arms, HEN. SEYMOUR, Esq.

Chaplain, Rev. F.Vernon Lockwood,M.A.

Secretary to Speaker, ED. PHILLIPS, Esq.

OFFICERS OF STATE.

(April, 1830.)

MINISTRY OF ENGLAND.

Duke of Wellington	*First Lord of the Treasury (Prime Minister).*
Right Hon. Henry Goulburn	*Chancellor and Under Treasurer of the Exchequer.*
Lord Lyndhurst	*Lord High Chancellor.*
Earl Bathurst	*Lord President of the Council.*
Earl of Rosslyn	*Lord Privy Seal.*
Right Hon. Robert Peel	*Secretary of State for the Home Department.*
Earl of Aberdeen	*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.*
Right Hon. Sir Geo. Murray	*Secretary of State for the Colonial Department.*
Lord Viscount Melville	*First Lord of the Admiralty.*
Right Hon. John C. Herries	*Master of the Mint.*
Lord Ellenborough	*President of the Board of Control.*
Right Hon. Thos. F. Lewis	*Treasurer of the Navy, and President of the Board of Trade.*

The above form the Cabinet.

Right Hon. Sir Hen. Hardinge	*Secretary at War.*
Viscount Beresford	*Master General of the Ordnance.*
Duke of Montrose	*Lord Chamberlain.*
Marquis Conyngham	*Lord Steward.*
Duke of Leeds	*Master of the Horse.*
Marquis of Winchester	*Groom of the Stole.*
Right Hon Ch. Arbuthnot	*Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.*
Right Hon. John Calcraft	*Paymaster of the Forces.*
Viscount Lowther	*First Commissioner of Land Revenue.*
Thomas P. Courtenay, Esq.	*Vice President of the Board of Trade.*
Duke of Manchester	*Postmaster General.*
Lord Robt. E. H. Somerset	*Lieut.-general of the Ordnance.*
Sir James Scarlett, Knt.	*Attorney General.*
Sir Edward B. Sugden, Knt.	*Solicitor General.*

MINISTRY OF IRELAND.

Duke of Northumberland	*Lord Lieutenant.*
Rt. Hon. Sir Anth. Hart, Knt.	*Lord High Chancellor.*
Lieut.-Gen. sir John Byng	*Commander of the Forces.*
Lord Francis Levison Gower	*Chief Secretary.*
Rt. Hon. Maurice Fitzgerald	*Vice Treasurer of the Exchequer*
Rt. Hon. Henry Joy	*Attorney General.*
John Doherty, Esq.	*Solicitor General*

As in adverting to any Proceedings in Parliament, the Reader must have frequent occasion to refer to "HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY," *and to the Series of* "HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES;" *the subjoined* TABLES, *which exhibit at one view the period comprised in each volume of those Works, will be found very useful.*

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

Shewing the A. D. and the A. R. in which the Thirty-six Volumes of HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY OF ENGLAND respectively commence and conclude.

VOL.					
I	6 Wm. I	1072	to	22 James I	1624
II	1 Chas. I	1625	..	18 Chas. I	1642
III	18 —— I	1642	..	12 —— II	1660
IV	12 —— II	1660	..	4 James II	1688
V	4 Jas. II	1688	..	13 Wm. III	1702
VI	1 Anne	1702	..	13 Anne	1714
VII	1 Geo. I	1714	..	8 Geo. I	1722
VIII	9 —— —	1722	..	6 Geo. II	1733
IX	6 Geo. II	1733	..	10 —— —	1737
X	10 —— —	1737	..	12 —— —	1739
XI	13 —— —	1739	..	14 —— —	1741
XII	14 —— —	1741	..	16 —— —	1743
XIII	16 —— —	1743	..	20 —— —	1747
XIV	20 —— —	1747	..	26 —— —	1753
XV	26 —— —	1753	..	4 Geo. III	1764
XVI	5 Geo. III	1765	..	11 —— —	1771
XVII	11 —— —	1771	..	14 —— —	1774
XVIII	15 —— —	1774	..	17 —— —	1777
XIX	17 —— —	1777	..	19 —— —	1778
XX	19 —— —	1778	..	20 —— —	1780
XXI	20 —— —	1780	..	21 —— —	1781
XXII	21 —— —	1781	..	22 —— —	1782
XXIII	22 —— —	1782	..	24 —— —	1783
XXIV	24 —— —	1783	..	25 —— —	1785
XXV	25 —— —	1785	..	26 —— —	1786
XXVI	26 —— —	1786	..	28 —— —	1788
XXVII	28 —— —	1788	..	29 —— —	1789
XXVIII	29 —— —	1789	..	31 —— —	1791
XXIX	31 —— —	1791	..	33 —— —	1792
XXX	33 —— —	1792	..	34 —— —	1794
XXXI	34 —— —	1794	..	35 —— —	1795
XXXII	35 —— —	1795	..	37 —— —	1797
XXXIII	37 —— —	1797	..	39 —— —	1798
XXXIV	39 —— —	1798	..	40 —— —	1800
XXXV	40 —— —	1800	..	41 —— —	1801
XXXVI	42 —— —	1801	..	43 —— —	1803

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

Shewing the A. D. and the A. R. in which the Volumes of the Series of HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES respectively commence and conclude.

First Series.

VOL.		
I—II	44 Geo. III	1803/4
III—V	45 —— —	1805
VI—VII	46 —— —	1806
VIII—IX	47 —— —	1806/7
X—XI	48 —— —	1808
XII—XIV	49 —— —	1809
XV—XVII	50 —— —	1810
XVIII—XX	51 —— —	1810/11
XXI—XXIII	52 —— —	1812
XXIV—XXVI	53 —— —	1812/13
XXVII—XXVIII	54 —— —	1813/14
XXIX—XXXI	55 —— —	1814/15
XXXII—XXXIV	56 —— —	1816
XXXV—XXXVI	57 —— —	1817
XXXVII—XXXVIII	58 —— —	1818
XXXIX—XL	59 —— —	1819
XLI	60 —— —	1819/20

New, or Second, Series.

VOL.		
I—III	1 Geo. IV	1820
IV—V	2 —— —	1821
VI—VII	3 —— —	1822
VIII—IX	4 —— —	1823
X—XI	5 —— —	1824
XII—XIII	6 —— —	1825
XIV—XVI	7 —— —	1826
XVII	8 —— —	1827
XVIII—XIX	9 —— —	1828
XX—XXI	10 —— —	1829
XXII—XXV	11 —— —	1830

Third Series.

VOL.		
I—	1 Will. IV.	1830/1

Shortly will be Published,

HANSARD'S
PARLIAMENTARY DIGEST;
OR, A
DICTIONARY OF READY REFERENCE,
TO THE
RECORDED PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES,
IN BOTH HOUSES.
FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE PRESENT TIME:

BEING

An Analytical Index:—I. To Hansard's Parliamentary History of England from the earliest Period to the Year 1803. —II. To Hansard's Parliamentary Debates from the Year 1803 to the present Time.

WITH

An Index containing the Name of every Member who took a part in the said Proceedings and Debates.

TO FORM TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

will be first published.

HANSARD'S

Parliamentary Debates

During the FIRST SESSION *of the* NINTH PARLIAMENT *of*
the United Kingdom of GREAT BRITAIN *and* IRELAND,
appointed to meet at Westminster, 26th October, 1830,
in the First Year of the Reign of His Majesty

WILLIAM THE FOURTH.

First Volume of the Session

1830—31.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, October 26, 1830.

PARLIAMENT was opened, by Commission, for the despatch of public business; the Lord Chancellor, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Rosslyn, and Earl Bathurst, being his Majesty's Commissioners. The Gentlemen of the House of Commons having been summoned to attend, about 100 Members of that House, headed by Mr. Ley, the chief clerk, came to the bar of the House of Peers. The Royal Commission having been read,

The *Lord Chancellor* said, I have to acquaint you that his Majesty has summoned both Houses to be sworn: before that can take place, it is necessary that a Speaker of the House of Commons should be first chosen; and it is his Majesty's pleasure that you should repair to the place where you usually meet, and there proceed to the choice of a proper person, to be presented here (if chosen) to-morrow, at twelve o'clock, for his Majesty's Royal approbation.

Several Peers took the usual oaths.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, Oct. 26.

The Lord Steward attended in the Long Gallery to swear in the Members of the House of Commons, and a considerable number were sworn in. The Commons being summoned, repaired to the House of Peers, accompanied by the Clerk of the House, and on their return, the Clerk informed the Members, that a Commission, appointed by his Majesty, had commanded the Commons to choose a Speaker.

CHOICE OF A SPEAKER.] Sir *Edward Hyde East* rose to propose a Speaker for the choice of the House. The honorable Member was understood to say, that when a new Parliament was assembled, it was essential to their future proceedings that they should obey the invitation they had received, and choose a Speaker. That was the first act the Commons had to perform. For a Speaker they ought to choose a person of the greatest ability, and possessing a character of the highest integrity—a person who by his worth and talents was fit and proper to represent the House of Commons, in all its proceedings before the eyes of the country, in its relations to the other House of Parliament, and in its communications with the Throne itself. They ought to choose a person who was capable, both by his public talents and his private virtues, to confer dignity on the proceedings of Parliament. In calling on the Members to make such a choice, he should not have thought himself entitled to claim their attention, had he not been assured that the Gentleman to whom he should propose that they should do the honour of offering the chair was a person already well acquainted with all the great interests and with all the wishes of the House; and that he was only giving expression to a desire which must be felt by every Gentleman of the House. They ought to choose a person of a high description, who was impressed with a necessity of preserving order in their proceedings, who had abilities to preserve that order, and who had, moreover, eloquence, grace, and dignity, to give effect to the proceedings of the House. He should be a person of great constitutional knowledge, well versed in the orders and forms of proceeding of the House, able to express the sentiments of the House as well to an individual appearing at the bar as to the other great branches of the Legislature. Besides the knowledge which was requisite to fill this great office efficiently, it was necessary, as every Member knew who had been engaged in private business, that the Speaker should be a gentleman of frank, conciliating, intelligent manners, not only able to give effect to the public acts of the House, but to give that information to individual Members which was necessary to facilitate the performance of their duties. There was no one qualification necessary and proper to execute the duties of this high office which had not been exhibited, as the House and the country well knew, by the right hon. Gentleman who had filled it for four successive Parliaments, and who had in an exemplary manner performed those duties, both private and public, which it was so important to the House should be well performed. He might say a great deal more in his praise, but it was unnecessary, when, from long acquaintance, it must be known to every Member of former Parliaments, that there was not one virtue, nor any species of ability necessary to fill that high station, and give effect to the proceedings of the House in the eyes of the country, which that gentleman did not possess. His merits were known to all the Members, and to the country at large. He would not further trespass on their time, but at once propose "That the right hon. Charles Manners Sutton be chosen Speaker."

Mr. *N. Calvert* said, that the House required as Speaker, a Gentleman able to preserve order in its proceedings, well acquainted with constitutional law, and with all the forms of the House; endowed with good temper, and of great impartiality. He should be a person easy of access, and whose gentlemanly manners would ensure him the support of all the Members, and to whom all might with pleasure refer all doubtful points, particularly of private business. He had looked over the list of representatives, and he had not been able to find one gentleman so well qualified to fill the office of Speaker as his right hon. friend, Mr. Manners Sutton, and he therefore had great pleasure in seconding the Motion.

Sir *Joseph Yorke* observed, that if ever there was a time when, from the state of public affairs, it was necessary, in order to gain the confidence of the Members, and give full effect to the proceedings of the House, that they ought to choose a proper person as Speaker, the present was the time. He concurred in all that had fallen from the Mover and Seconder. He was sure that there was not in the House a single person better qualified—that there was no one equal, he would not say—for amidst all the Members of the House, men of talents, of different professions, of great virtue and integrity, some equally proper person might be found; but he must say, that from the great suavity of the individual named, as well as his great knowledge, he was a fit and proper person to fill the Chair in as tremendous times as ever any man was called to fill it in.

Mr. *Manners Sutton*: Long as it has been my pride to be the servant of the House, and frequently as I have had occasion to address it, yet it is impossible for me entirely to divest myself of embarrassment, and not to feel some distrust of myself in returning my thanks to my hon. friends who have proposed me to the House as a fit and proper person for the high office of Speaker, as well as for the terms in which they were pleased to express their sentiments of me; I must also acknowledge the speech of the Gallant Admiral, and his great kindness and cordiality. I would beg them to believe that I feel the great kindness and obligation with which the House received, and one of them made, and the other seconded, the motion. I think it most respectful to the House of Commons at once to declare that I am proud to submit to its will. If the House places me in this situation, I shall with pride and devotedness exert myself to maintain all its rights and privileges; and to the extent of my abilities I will discharge all the duties of the station. I know, from some experience, that the difficulties of the situation are not small, but experience has also taught me that honesty of purpose, and earnest and strict impartiality, will ensure the encouragement, the support, and the protection of the House. [The right hon. Gentleman was voted into the chair by acclamation, and conducted into it by the mover and Seconder.] When the right hon. Gentleman had taken the chair, he said, I am most anxious that the House should believe that I am not indifferent to these expressions, and that I am deeply grateful for the honour conferred on me. I beg to assure the House that I am deeply sensible of this mark of its confidence, and that I will do all in my power to deserve it.

Adjournment — Business of the House.] Sir *Robert Peel*, in moving that the House do adjourn, begged to take that opportunity of offering to the Speaker his most sincere congratulations at the unanimity with which he had obtained an honour he so well deserved. He begged also to congratulate the House that it was enabled to place in the chair, a Gentleman of great experience in public business, and well entitled, by his conduct in the Chair, to the approbation and confidence of the House. In the fourteen years which had elapsed since he had been first placed in that situation, he believed that during those fourteen years there had been only one single day in which the right hon. Gentleman had asked, or rather consented, to a remission of his public labours. No considerations of personal convenience—no consideration of his private affairs—nothing but the claims of private affliction, could make him even consent to abstract that day from the public service. During these fourteen years, whatever might have been the conflict of parties, all his opinions and all his decisions had been given with the strictest impartiality, and received with satisfaction by the House. But the right hon. Gentleman's merits were so familiarly known to all the Members, that it was unnecessary for him to say more. The unanimous vote of that evening secured the devotion of the House to its Speaker, and it was impossible that the public and the country should not find that, in addressing the Members, the unanimity would give authority to his opinions and weight to his decision.

Mr. *Brougham* seconded the Motion; and expressed his satisfaction and entire concurrence in the well-merited encomiums which the House had respectfully tendered. His object in rising, however, was to direct the attention of his Majesty's Government, and of such Members as attended to the public business, to a subject which urgently demanded attention, to which he had on former occasions adverted —he meant the business of the House— that they might turn the matter in their minds during the week which would elapse before the House began the effective business of the country. He had adverted more than once to the necessity of some arrangement by which the private business should be separated from the public business, securing to the latter a sufficient time for its discussion. He only wished, however, to throw out some hints on this subject for reflection during the week. He was confident, that unless some arrangement were made, by which the private business should be postponed or brought forward on separate and distinct nights, or by which the time of the House should not be occupied in hearing petitions from individuals on private subjects, or expressing their individual opinions on public affairs, he was confident, unless something was done to call on public business at a reasonable hour, that they would not be able to get through with it. He wished merely to direct the attention of Members to this subject, and should be ready to support any proposition which would secure to the country, that a proper share of the time of its Representatives should be devoted to its business.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, Oct. 27.

The Lord Chancellor, the Earl of Rosslyn, Earl Bathurst, Lord Ellenborough, and Lord Melville, sat at twelve o'clock, as his Majesty's Commissioners, to signify the Royal Assent to the choice of a Speaker made by the House of Commons. The Commons having been summoned to the bar, and a great number of Members having accompanied the Speaker thither,

Mr. *Manners Sutton* addressed their Lordships as follows:—"I have to acquaint your Lordships, that in obedience to his Majesty's commands, his Majesty's faithful Commons have proceeded to elect a Speaker, and that their choice has fallen on me. I well know, from the experience I have already had, what are the duties of that important office; and I feel, as I ought, a great mistrust in my own powers to execute that office; but if it should be his Majesty's pleasure to disapprove of the choice, I now announce to your Lordships that his Majesty's faithful Commons will at once elect another Speaker.

The *Lord Chancellor*.—Mr. Sutton, I am commanded by his Majesty to assure you, that his Majesty is so fully sensible of your zeal for the public service, and of the sufficiency of your abilities to discharge the duties connected with the office, that he most willingly approves of the choice that has been made by his faithful Commons.

The *Speaker*.—My Lords; with a deep sense of gratitude I submit to his Majesty's will, and it now becomes my duty, in the name and on the behalf of the Commons of the United Kingdom, to lay claim by petition to all their undoubted rights and privileges,—more especially those of freedom from arrest for themselves, their servants and estates—of freedom in debate —and free access to his Majesty whenever occasion may require; and I have also to beg his Majesty's most favourable construction of all their doings; and that if any error should be committed, it may be attributed to me alone, and not to his faithful Commons.

The *Lord Chancellor*.—Mr. Speaker, I have it further in command to inform you, that it is his Majesty's most gracious will to confirm all those rights and privileges that have been allowed by his Royal predecessors. With respect to yourself (though his Majesty is sensible that you stand in need of no such assurance), his Majesty will ever put the most favourable construction on your words and actions.

The Commons withdrew, and the House proceeded with the swearing in of Peers.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, Oct. 27.

The House met at twelve o'clock, and shortly afterwards the Speaker, accompanied by several Members, proceeded to the House of Lords. On his return, the Speaker informed the House, that the Royal Commissioners had signified his Majesty's gracious approbation of the choice which his faithful Commons had made of a person to fill the Chair. He had claimed all the rights and privileges heretofore enjoyed by the House of Commons, and the Commissioners had declared that his Majesty granted them to as full an extent as had been done by any of his predecessors.

The process of swearing in Members was then continued.

LORDS AND COMMONS,

From Thursday, Oct. 28, to Monday, Nov. 2, inclusive.

The two Houses met every day between these dates, except Saturday and Sunday, for the purpose of swearing in the Members, but no other business was done.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, November 2.

THE KING'S SPEECH ON OPENING THE SESSION.] His Majesty went in state to the House of Lords this day, and the Commons having been summoned to the bar of the House of Peers, his Majesty delivered the following Speech:—

"My Lords and Gentlemen,

"It is with great satisfaction that I meet you in Parliament, and that I am enabled, in the present conjuncture, to recur to your advice.

"Since the dissolution of the late Parliament, events of deep interest and importance have occurred on the Continent of Europe.

"The Elder Branch of the House of Bourbon no longer reigns in France, and the Duke of Orleans has been called to the Throne by the title of King of the French.

"Having received from the new Sovereign a declaration of his earnest desire to cultivate the good understanding, and to maintain inviolate all the engagements subsisting with this country, I did not hesitate to continue my diplomatic relations and friendly intercourse with the French Court.

"I have witnessed, with deep regret, the state of affairs in the Low Countries.

"I lament that the enlightened Administration of the King should not have preserved his dominions from revolt; and that the wise and prudent measure of submitting the desires and the complaints of his people to the deliberations of an Extraordinary Meeting of the States General should have led to no satisfactory result. I am endeavouring, in concert with my Allies, to devise such means of restoring tranquillity as may be compatible with the welfare and good government of the Netherlands, and with the future security of other States.

"Appearances of tumult and disorder have produced uneasiness in different parts of Europe; but the assurances of a friendly disposition, which I continue to receive from all Foreign Powers, justify the expectation that I shall be enabled to preserve for my people the blessings of peace.

"Impressed at all times with the necessity of respecting the faith of national engagements, I am persuaded that my determination to maintain, in conjunction with my Allies, those general Treaties by which the political system of Europe has been established, will offer the best security for the repose of the world.

"I have not yet accredited my Ambassador to the Court of Lisbon; but the Portuguese Government having determined to perform a great act of justice and humanity, by the grant of a general amnesty, I think that the time may shortly arrive when the interests of my subjects will demand a renewal of those relations which had so long existed between the two countries.

"I am impelled, by the deep solicitude which I feel for the welfare of my people, to recommend to your immediate consideration the provisions which it may be advisable to make for the exercise of the Royal Authority, in case that it should please Almighty God to terminate my life before my successor shall have arrived at years of maturity.

"I shall be prepared to concur with you in the adoption of those measures which may appear best calculated to maintain unimpaired the stability and dignity of the Crown, and thereby to strengthen the securities by which the Civil and Religious Liberties of my People are guarded.

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons,

"I have ordered the Estimates for those Services of the present year, for which the last Parliament did not fully provide, to be forthwith laid before you. The Estimates for the ensuing year will be prepared with that strict regard to economy which I am determined to enforce in every branch of the Public Expenditure.

"By the demise of my lamented brother, the late King, the Civil List Revenue has expired.

"I place without reserve at your disposal my interest in the Hereditary Revenues, and in those funds which may be derived from any Droits of the Crown or Admiralty, from the West-India Duties, or from any casual revenues, either in my foreign possessions or in the United Kingdom.

"In surrendering to you my interest in revenues which have in former settlements of the Civil List been reserved to the Crown, I rejoice in the opportunity of evincing my entire reliance on your dutiful attachment, and my confidence that you will cheerfully provide all that may be necessary for the support of the Civil Government, and the honour and dignity of my Crown.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,

"I deeply lament that in some districts

of the country the property of my subjects has been endangered by combinations for the destruction of machinery; and that serious losses have been sustained through the acts of wicked incendiaries.

"I cannot view without grief and indignation the efforts which are industriously made to excite among my people a spirit of discontent and disaffection, and to disturb the concord which happily prevails between those parts of my dominions, the union of which is essential to their common strength and common happiness.

"I am determined to exert to the utmost of my power all the means which the Law and the Constitution have placed at my disposal, for the punishment of sedition, and for the prompt suppression of outrage and disorder.

"Amidst all the difficulties of the present conjuncture, I reflect with the highest satisfaction on the loyalty and affectionate attachment of the great body of my people.

"I am confident that they justly appreciate the full advantage of that happy form of Government, under which, through the favour of Divine Providence, this country has enjoyed, for a long succession of years, a greater share of internal peace, of commercial prosperity, of true liberty, of all that constitutes social happiness, than has fallen to the lot of any other country of the world. It is the great object of my life to preserve these blessings to my people, and to transmit them unimpaired to posterity; and I am animated in the discharge of the sacred duty which is committed to me, by the firmest reliance on the wisdom of Parliament, and on the cordial support of my faithful and loyal subjects."

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO THE SPEECH.] The Marquis of *Bute* said, he rose to move their Lordships to agree to an humble Address to his Majesty, in reply to the gracious Speech which had been just read to the House—a Speech so frank, so affectionate and consolatory, that he thought he should but ill discharge his duty to their Lordships and the subject if he attempted to burthen it with many observations of his own. He felt assured that his Majesty would have, from the voice of a unanimous Parliament, the full assurance that he would not be mistaken in the confidence with which he treated them. Events of an extraordinary character had taken place since their Lordships had last assembled together in that House; but those events, though of so notorious a character that his Majesty's advisers would have been deserving of blame had they not noticed them, were obviously of a description which precluded the details from being made a subject of discussion in Parliament. He was persuaded that their Lordships would concur with him in believing that his Majesty's Ministers had acted properly in frankly recommending his Majesty to acknowledge the present Monarch of France, and in doing so he was sure that they acted in accordance with the general wishes of the people of this country. He rejoiced—he sincerely rejoiced—at the mutual good understanding which so happily existed between the two great Powers of France and England: he rejoiced at it, because he saw in their mutual good-will the best assurances, the best possible pledge for the permanent peace of Europe. Entering further into his Majesty's Speech, Parliament, he would observe, must find it very agreeable to receive proofs and assurances that all the Powers of Europe had observed their obligations. It was particularly gratifying to see that France was disposed to preserve inviolate the faith of treaties, without doing which a nation might attain a momentary greatness, but could never be permanently prosperous. Their Lordships were aware, that by the additional Article of a Treaty to which we were parties, and to which our Ally, France, was also a party —a treaty that was known by its local name of the Fundamental Law—their Lordships were aware that by that treaty arrangements were made, by which the Provinces of Belgium were declared to form an integral part of the dominions of the King of the Netherlands. He saw, therefore, and he had no doubt their Lordships saw, with much pain, the wretched condition at present of the Low Countries, particularly as the king of that country had called together an extraordinary meeting of the States General, hoping, by his honest constitutional views, to restore tranquillity; acting by that in such a manner as must be pleasing to Englishmen, and as they might expect from a Prince of the illustrious House of Nassau. That Prince had, on many occasions of his past life, shown himself worthy of his ancestry; but the rapidity of events had frustrated the fair prospects of social arrangements by which he hoped to preserve his dominions in peace. Their Lordships would join with him in assuring his Majesty of their regret on this subject. Their Lordships would perceive that by the treaty to which he had alluded, the King of the Netherlands felt himself precluded from giving his assent to any resolution which gave a separate establishment to Belgium, and a separate constitution, without previously communicating with his allies, under whose guarantee the Fundamental Law was adopted. Reverting, then, to another subject, he must say that he was happy to see a prospect of a termination to the present state of our relations with Portugal. The obstacle which had hitherto stood in the way of that restoration was an arrangement into which this country, in concurrence with the other great Powers of Europe, had entered with the members of the House of Braganza. He must confess, that he had frequently looked forward with something like impatience to the time when we might honourably relieve ourselves from that engagement. A full and entire amnesty had now been granted by the government of Portugal to those who had defended the cause of Donna Maria. When those honourable men who adhered to the cause of Donna Maria, in conformity with what they understood to be the established arrangements of the Royal family of Portugal, sanctioned by the leading Powers, — when those men should be again restored to the bosom of their country, he must confess he could not see on what grounds his Majesty's advisers would be justified in abstaining from restoring to the actual government of Portugal those direct diplomatic relations, the interruption of which had been attended with no little inconvenience to the interests of the country. His Majesty had remarked in the Speech, and their Lordships must have learnt the same fact from the usual channels for conveying information to the public, that symptoms of discontent and disorder had manifested themselves in various parts of Europe; but their Lordships would see that they were all of a local nature, and were no cause of apprehension to us. He found in them a new proof of the high character which this great and happy country had acquired in the civilized world. He trusted their Lordships would readily agree with his Majesty, and believe that he declared what was agreeable to the sentiments of the great majority of his subjects, when he said, that he meant to maintain the general national obligations by which we were bound. His Majesty thought, no doubt, and so would his subjects, that by such means he should best maintain the high character of the country. He could not approach without considerable pain the first topic of his Majesty's Speech, which was purely of a domestic nature. His Majesty, feeling his advanced period of life, had invited the Parliament to take into early consideration measures for providing a Regency in case of his Majesty's death before his successor had arrived at years of maturity. He felt, and he had no doubt their Lordships would feel themselves, prepared to comply with his Majesty's invitation, and that they would desire to apply themselves to the serious consideration of such measures as his Majesty's advisers should on this subject submit to Parliament. In that sentiment he was sure their Lordships would all concur, as they would in the prayer he addressed to Almighty God, that the period might never arrive when any enactment on this subject would be brought into operation. Parliament could not have better instructions for the framing of a measure upon this subject than the manly and constitutional declaration which his Majesty had made of the principles on which it ought to proceed. He knew well that their Lordships were strictly bound to consider the Speech delivered from the Throne as the composition of Ministers; but if ever there was an occasion which would justify the supposition that the sentiments uttered by his Majesty were the sentiments of the individual who delivered them, it was the present. He thought he might venture to say, that the Speech which they had heard that day, and the declaration they had heard of his Majesty's principles, with the measure he had recommended them to adopt, was decidedly the language of the heart. He also begged pardon for going a little out of his way to make an allusion to that part of his Majesty's Speech which was more particularly addressed to the other House of Parliament. It was not a usual occurrence, however, for his Majesty to make a new contract with his subjects for his Revenue, and as that was now the case, he could hardly allow it to pass unnoticed. He had very often heard the most erroneous opinions concerning the nature of the revenue enjoyed by the Crown, and he believed that to this day the most erroneous opinions concerning the Civil List were prevalent. There was no subject perhaps of great public interest on which the enlightened people of this country were in general so ill-informed. Perhaps he was wrong, but he believed that few individuals could be found in the kingdom who had made such sacrifices for the benefit of their private families as the Sovereigns of this country, particularly since the accession of George 3rd, had made of their income for the benefit of their subjects. It was well known to their Lordships, that the Hereditary Revenues enjoyed by the Kings of this realm, up to the accession of King George 3rd, and, consequently, during the reign of the last two Sovereigns, had greatly exceeded the amount of the sums placed by Parliament on the Civil List for the service of the Throne, out of which the whole expense of the civil government of the country, and of many proceedings necessary to support the dignity of the Throne and the empire had to be maintained. He could not let this part of his Majesty's Speech pass without, on his part, some expressions of acknowledgment to the Crown for the manner in which his Majesty had come forward to place at the disposal of Parliament a fund belonging to the Crown, which had never, on any previous occasion, been surrendered to the use of his people. In paying tribute to this act of Royal munificence on the part of his present Majesty, he was only anxious he should not be understood to throw any reflection upon the late King. Their Lordships all knew that his late Majesty was no less ready to pay attention to the advice of his servants, and no less willing to consent that his hereditary Revenues should be given up. He would venture to allude to that measure which had the sanction of Parliament last year —that most beneficial measure of the abolition of the Beer-duties. Let their Lordships not forget that those duties were so connected with the hereditary revenue, that the measure could not have been brought forward without having received the approbation of his Majesty. Let them not forget that, by the abolition of those Beer-duties, a sum of no less an amount than between 300,000*l.* and 400,000*l.* yearly, which strictly formed part of the Hereditary Revenues of the Crown, was given up for the permanent relief of the people. He had taken pains to inquire into the matter, and he found that, by the abolition of those duties, there would be a reduction of nearly 300 officers of the Excise, and, of course, their salaries would be gained to the country. He was not one of those who attached much importance to professions, which might happen to be made in either House of Parliament—he was one of those who were rather to apt judge from acts than words; and when he saw a measure adopted, in which so much of Ministerial patronage was given up—when he saw that measure followed by the proposal of his Majesty, to surrender to the use of his people every sort of Hereditary Revenue, which had been on former occasions reserved to the Crown—he felt strong grounds for placing confidence, and he thought the country would place confidence, in the assurances of economy which were contained in that part of his Majesty's Speech which was addressed to the House of Commons. He felt his utter inability to do justice to the concluding part of his Majesty's Speech. He deeply regretted that within the last two months, circumstances should have arisen which prevented his Majesty from proceeding at once to that speedy and affectionate view of the condition of his subjects, which it was evident was the natural wish of the Royal heart. He lamented that acts of a desolating nature had been committed in one of the fairest parts of the country. He knew his Majesty would use a firm hand to prevent their repetition. He warmly concurred in the indignation expressed by his Majesty at the attempts lately made to excite, in the inhabitants of Ireland, a spirit of jealousy and dissatisfaction with respect to their connection with Great Britain. He could hardly trust himself to speak upon the subject. He could not conceive an act more criminal —more cruel, in any man of education (he did not speak personally), than to attempt to delude his less-educated countrymen on such a question. He would ask their Lordships what was now the great evil of Ireland?—Poverty he imagined to be the evil; and yet, at the very moment when the capital of this richer portion of the United Kingdom had, at last, begun to flow towards that long distracted country—at such a moment we saw the pretended friends of the labouring classes of Ireland endeavouring to impress them with the notion that Great Britain was the source of their distress. He could not think that any considerable portion of the intelligent inhabitants of Ireland were misled by these doctrines. It was their Lordships' duty to assure his Majesty that their Lordships concurred entirely in the intention, expressed by his Majesty, of employing, to the utmost of his power, the means he possessed for suppressing such attempts. He for one was ready to deliberate on any other measures which might be necessary to secure the tranquillity of that country. Their Lordships, he was sure, were also prepared to express their entire concurrence in the view taken by his Majesty of the condition and feelings of the country. He believed there was no country in the world where the condition of all its inhabitants was so freely and so honestly made known. He looked to the general character of the laws and the legislation of this realm, and he would contend that the humbler classes of society still relied upon their Lordships as their natural protectors and hereditary defenders. They looked up to their Lordships, not with feelings of feudal terror, but with feelings resulting from the recollection of mutual kindnesses. If their Lordships encouraged such feelings, he was satisfied the great bulk of the people of this country would repel all attempts to disunite them. It was with the most sincere pleasure he could venture to bear his testimony to the allusion made by his Majesty to the improving condition of the country. Every day brought fresh proof of increasing activity in the manufacturing districts. He had been informed of a fact which was most satisfactory; namely, that, of all manufactured produce, the greatest increase had been in those articles, which were made up for the consumption and wear of the labouring classes of the country. He was perfectly aware that considerable pressure still prevailed in many of the agricultural districts. In the manufacturing districts wages were rising every day, and he had not heard any difference of opinion upon the point that there was not a man who could not find full employment. Such a condition of things could not continue in the manufacturing districts, without the labourers in the agricultural districts sharing in the benefit. But, though distress prevailed in the agricultural districts, yet, comparing their present condition with what it was a few months ago, it could not be denied that there were signs of progressive improvement. He had no doubt there was still much to be done, and he was sure it would be done by the benevolent exertions of their Lordships on their own estates. His Majesty had been an observer of the people of this country—he knew from his personal experience the general respect felt towards him by every class in the empire. He knew the piety and moderation of our clergy—he knew the integrity of our laity in every profession—he was beloved no less by the poor than by the rich. These were the grounds of his Majesty's confidence—these were the grounds of his affection; that confidence was mutual—that affection was returned. He had taken up much of their Lordships' time—he would only further attempt to define that which he believed to be the happy feeling of the people of this country towards the King upon the Throne, by borrowing the description of a truly English verse of former days—

"Here willing nations know their lawful Lord."

The noble Marquis concluded by moving an Address, which was as usual, an echo of the Speech.

Lord Monson seconded the Motion, but his Lordship's remarks were inaudible.

The Lord Chancellor put the question.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* said, it was not his intention to trespass long on their Lordships' time. There was one part of the gracious communication which the Sovereign had been pleased to make this day, which he was sure would be received by the country with heartfelt gratification—it was the recommendation, that the strictest economy should be pursued in every important branch of the public expenditure, and not only pursued, but that his Majesty was determined to enforce it. In the present state of this country it was by economy alone that we could restore peace and tranquillity, and give confidence to the agricultural population—amongst whom, notwithstanding what had fallen from the noble Marquis, he maintained, that distress existed to a considerable extent—distress from the pressure of taxes upon the necessaries of life. Their Lordships would ill discharge the duty they owed to themselves and the country, if they did not institute an immediate inquiry into the state of the agricultural population of this country for the purpose of endeavouring to ascertain what relief could be given where the taxes pressed heavily, and whether it was in the power of the House to remove those taxes by substituting others. He regretted that disturbances of no ordinary character had disgraced one part of the country: but, before he entered upon this subject, he should most distinctly give it as his opinion, and he believed he should be borne out in that opinion by every respectable individual connected with the county, that none of the peasantry of the county had been engaged in those disturbances. He should treat with scorn and contempt any individual who dared to impute to the honest peasantry of Kent any participation in those fires which had gone to such an extent as to create alarm and terror amongst the inhabitants of that county. The incendiaries had hitherto escaped detection, but whenever detection took place—as he was confident it would, sooner or later—he was sure that the honest peasantry of the county would not be found concerned in these disgraceful transactions. So far was he from agreeing with the opinion of the noble Marquis who moved the Address, that distress did not exist—

The Marquis of *Bute*: I beg to correct the noble Lord—I said no such thing.

The Earl of *Winchilsea*, in continuation: So far from that being the case, he knew that in many districts of Kent, so reduced had the property of the owners and occupiers of the soil become, that, in numerous instances, employment could not be found, and the great body of the agricultural population had it not in their power, either to find or to give adequate wages for labour. In many instances the consequence was, that a great part of the population was unemployed during the winter; and such was the distress of the occupiers of land, that the labourers were obliged to take up their wages in commodities at the village-shop, where it was not to be expected that they could obtain an adequate remuneration. If this did not show, that the land-owners and occupiers were distressed, he asked the noble Marquis (Bute) what would? And he believed, if a fair inquiry were instituted, it would be found that the capital of the land-occupiers was seriously diminished, and that, in many cases, they had been reduced from affluence to misery and want. As he had stated last year, when he had implored their Lordships to inquire into their wants, that a great part of the honest and independent yeomanry of the country were going to decay, so he would now repeat, that in his neighbourhood they were considerably reduced in numbers. He would say but little with respect to the commotions in the county of Kent, and it was a satisfaction to him to know, that Government would lose no time in calling forth the energies of those who were interested in the preservation of peace and good order. He would say, that the spirit which was abroad was one of danger; but he had also the satisfaction to state, that, of the great body of the yeomanry of that part of Kent in which he resided, there was not one individual whom he had addressed who did not express himself ready to give every assistance, in any way that might be required, for the repression of the disgraceful outrages. Their conduct was highly satisfactory. He hoped that the strict economy recommended by his Majesty would be rigidly enforced, and also that a minute inquiry would be made into the state of the agricultural interests, in order to see what reduction of taxes could take place, and what relief it was possible to afford; for sure he was, that want of employment alone was the cause of the insubordination prevailing amongst the peasantry. Whether a measure could be carried, to compel the land-owners to employ a fair proportion of labourers during the winter months was a matter that required consideration, but he thought that there ought to be some such provision; for in many parishes where there were eight or ten farmers who were ready to give fair wages, there might be found four or five in opposition, and, as there was no law of a compulsory character to enforce this, the good intentions of the others fell to the ground. He had last Session thought of such a provision for the parish in Northamptonshire in which he resided, and he would shortly bring it before their Lordships. The noble Lord concluded by imploring every individual in the House to make minute inquiries, in the respective counties in which they resided, into the state of the agricultural interest, because he was certain that, were this attended to, it would, in most instances, be followed by the greatest benefit.

The Marquis of *Camden* said, he felt it his duty, from the first moment he came into the House, to present himself to its notice. He had yesterday attended at Maidstone, and he should be sorry to enter into a controversy with his noble friend opposite (Winchilsea), such as he was compelled to enter into in the last Session of Parliament, nor should he be seduced then to discuss whether more distress prevailed in the last year than in the year 1822; but he would say, that the distress now prevailing was not in any degree comparable to that which existed last year. If that were so, why should there not have been more outrages, while the people were said to be starving in the severity of winter, than now, when we enjoyed what was undeniably a genial autumn? The fact was, that what had taken place on the other side of the Channel had sent forth many evil-disposed spirits. He pitied the wretches who caused fires and broke machinery; but, if misery and hardship were the cause of these outrages, their pressure was more severe in the last than in the present season; and he, therefore, attributed these outrages to the spirit now abroad. He did not mean to say that there was any individual concerned in these proceedings who meant anything against the Constitution of the country; but he believed, in that part of Kent where the noble Earl resided, they were the consequences of a prejudice against the use of machinery, and not of distress. He believed that there were parts of Kent, as there were parts of other counties, in distress; and in some parts of that county there was an administration of the Poor-laws which was not wise. He did not suppose that so extensive an inquiry as was necessary could be had in a fortnight or three weeks; but he saw a spirit in the farmers, and he was sure it was in the gentry, which would induce every one to look to the management of their farms. He therefore thought, whether Parliament adopted any measures or not, that there would be a union of all classes to put down the outrages that prevailed. As to the conflagrations, he was sorry that the inhabitants of the county of Kent could be capable of devising or executing them; at the same time that the manner in which they were effected showed that they were done more to excite terror than any other cause. The barns and stacks of all classes were burned, and the fires were not confined to those of harsh landlords or greedy overseers. Hitherto there had not been an adequate spirit of inquiry; but now, so anxious was the desire to investigate the causes—and he was sure the Government was convinced of the necessity of giving every assistance for the discovery of the offenders—that these excesses would very soon be put down. He trusted, that, ere long, the alarm of his neighbours would wear away, and the reputation of the county be freed from the odium at present brought upon it. He was sure that the best way to effect this would be for the yeomanry to come forward, and offer their services. He was one who thought that in times like these every one ought to do his utmost, and there was no one more desirous than he was to alleviate the distress that existed. As to the other topics of the King's Speech, he thought it would be more decorous not to enter upon them, and therefore he would not further detain their Lordships.

The Duke of *Richmond* said, it was not his intention to take up more than a very short portion of their Lordships' time, but he was anxious to take this opportunity of expressing a hope that Parliament would no longer delay—that it would not put off until it might, perhaps, be too late—an inquiry into the state of the labouring poor. He hoped the subject would be taken up with a view to a fair inquiry He assured their Lordships that he said this, not in the spirit of faction, for it was admitted by the noble Marquis (the Lord-lieutenant of the county of Kent) that great distress did prevail in that county, though he had added that that distress was not so great in that particular county as it was last year. The noble Marquis seemed to think, that the outrages which existed in that county were not the result of the distress that prevailed. He (the Duke of Richmond) would not say what was the cause of those outrages; but whatever might be their origin, it could not be denied, that last Session the Tables of their Lordships' House were covered with petitions, complaining of the distresses of the labouring poor. The subject of those petitions their Lordships had not thought it necessary to take into consideration, and he believed that that circumstance had taught the labouring poor not to look to Parliament with that confidence which they had been accustomed to feel towards the Government and Legislature of the country. He believed a feeling did prevail amongst the labouring classes, that the upper classes were their foes, and not their friends. That this was a most serious error on the part of the labouring poor, he fully admitted. He knew that their Lordships, and the other House of Parliament, were the friends of the poor, and he knew that the cause of the delay of inquiry last Session was to be found, not in the indifference of Parliament to the poor, but to incredulity as to the extent of that distress; but, seeing what had since occurred, he must say, that it would be criminal to delay the matter any longer. The county of Kent had since then spoken in a language which was disgraceful; but, while he said this, and while he admitted, that the outrages to which he alluded should be put down with a strong hand,—for no distress would justify such violations of law,—he still must impress on their Lordships the necessity of no longer postponing a fair and full inquiry into the state of the labouring poor. For himself he would say, that he felt no alarm for the ultimate state of the country, for he knew that Englishmen possessed too much good sense, and too much devotion to the institutions of their country,—too much loyal attachment to the person of their gracious Sovereign, who had that day, for the first time, met his people at the opening of a new Parliament, and who, from the moment of his accession to the Throne, had on every occasion evinced the most paternal regard for the interests of his subjects—Englishmen, he repeated, possessed too much wisdom and good feeling—to allow themselves to be led away into errors dangerous to the security of the State. Whatever was the condition of the country at present, there could exist no reason for alarm as to the ultimate result; but it was necessary that the inquiry to which he alluded should not be further delayed. He spoke this, not with a view of creating any excitement out of doors, but to impress on their Lordships that conviction which he strongly felt, of the necessity that the inquiry should be speedy. On this he trusted their Lordships would be unanimous, and while they put down dangerous acts of riot and insubordination by force, if necessary, they should not delay adopting such other measures as might tend, by relieving the distresses of the poor, to restore to them that confidence in the Legislature which was so necessary to the tranquillity of the country. He would not offer any opposition to the Address moved by the noble Marquis, but he must express a hope, that before the close of the debate, he should hear from the noble Duke (Wellington) that he should be ready with some measure, having for its object that to which he had adverted. It was necessary to the tranquillity of the country, during the winter now coming on, that the confidence of the labouring classes in the Legislature should be restored by the adoption of every possible means to improve their condition.

The Earl of *Darnley* said, he would detain their Lordships only a few moments. The state of the country had, in the course of the last Session, been several times the subject of discussion, and on these occasions, believing as he did that the distress which prevailed was only partial, he had deprecated any exaggerated statements respecting it, and had also opposed the motion for inquiry, on the ground that it would tend to no practical good. With respect to the nocturnal outrages which had since taken place in the county of Kent, he was of opinion that they ought to be put down by the strictest application of the law; and when that was done, he thought it would not be unbecoming their Lordships to make the experiment of an inquiry as to the cause of the distress, and the condition of the poor. He himself had been visited by some of those nocturnal depredators, and he agreed with his noble friend in believing that none of the nightly outrages that now disgraced the county of Kent were committed by the industrious working classes of that county. They were the work of, he believed, persons who did not belong to the county. He wished to take that opportunity of correcting a mis-statement which had been made in one of the Kent news-papers, and which had been copied from that into most of the London papers. It was stated, that on the occasion when some of his property was burned, the peasantry looked on without any attempt to assist in extinguishing the flames, but that they rather seemed to enjoy the spectacle. Now, the very reverse was the fact. He had suffered only to a trifling extent; but so far were the peasantry from refusing their aid, that not only his own labourers, but those of others came and voluntarily assisted and worked, heart and hand, to put out the flames. Some of them were for nearly two hours up to their middle in water on the occasion. He was not present himself, but his son and others who were, and on whose testimony he could implicitly rely, stated the fact, that these men worked with the greatest alacrity, and without, as far as he knew, any hope of reward. It was a great satisfaction to him afterwards to address sixty of them after they had been paid for their exertions, and to thank them for their excellent conduct on the occasion. He felt it necessary to say this, in justice to the character of the peasantry, and in corroboration of what had been stated by his noble friend, that the peasantry of Kent were not the authors of those outrages. He thought that this was also a proof that the noble Duke (Richmond) was not correct in supposing that these outrages were the result of there having been no inquiry last Session into the condition of the labouring poor. He would admit that distress did exist in some parts of the country, but it was not general. Whatever was its extent, one fertile source of misery might be found in the very erroneous system of paying the wages of the poor out of the parochial rates. He would admit that distress existed, and he thought one of the first steps for its relief—and that which he believed the noble Duke was disposed to take—was reduction of the public expenditure. Of this reduction he believed the Sovereign, who for the first time appeared there to-day to open a new Parliament, and who on every occasion since his accession had done that which would well deserve for him the title of the patriot King, was disposed to set the first example. He trusted it would be so, and that his Majesty's views in this respect would be ably seconded by that House; for he was sure that their Lordships would not obtain that respect which for the sake of the country it was so necessary they should command, if they did not earnestly set themselves about those necessary reforms, which must begin with the upper classes to be generally beneficial.

The Duke of *Leinster* said, that he had just come from that portion of the United Kingdom, to the condition of which allusion had been made in the Speech from the Throne; and he was anxious to say a word as to the feeling which existed there on the subject of the repeal of the Union. That feeling had not, he believed, yet gained much ground in Ireland. He was present a few days ago at a private meeting of gentlemen deeply interested in the prosperity of that country, which he had felt it necessary to call together, and it was the general opinion of those present, that the repeal of the Union was a measure which would be most injurious in its effects to both countries. But while he expressed his opinion, that the feeling in favour of that measure had not proceeded to any great extent, he must say, that unless Government adopted some measures,—he did not mean strong measures, but some plan for the employment of the poor--some plan to reform the Grand-Jury-system, and other matters to which he would not, at that moment, allude more in detail,—the project for a repeal of the Union would get a-head, so that it would be extremely difficult to deal with it. He repeated, he would not, at that moment, point out in detail the particular plans which it would be advisable to adopt; but he had no doubt whatever, that some plan for the relief of Ireland, by giving employment to the poor, ought instantly to be devised.

Lord *Farnham* said, that the present moment was one of the most important at which a Parliament had met for many years, whether considered with relation to our foreign or domestic policy. There were dangers from within and without, and the best way to avert them was to look them boldly in the face. The Speech from the Throne informed them that this country continued on terms of peace and amity with the several Powers of Europe; but who were the Powers of Europe at present? He knew that the illustrious Prince who now sat on the Throne of France was strongly disposed to continue the relations of peace and amity with this country; but who knew whether affairs in that country might not take a turn which would oblige its Sovereign to adopt measures towards this country which he himself could not approve? As to Belgium, to which the Royal Speech had adverted, and which had been alluded to by the noble Marquis who moved the Address, were we not a party to treaties respecting that country, which might bring us into unpleasant collision with some of the Powers of Europe? But when all Europe was in arms, was England to be the only one with her bosom open? He agreed with other noble Lords in thinking that there could be no ultimate fear for this country if her energies were well directed. The greatest difficulty with which we had to contend arose from the state of our finances. Taxation was already stretched as far as it could go, in relation to our agriculture, our commerce, and manufactures. These interests were burthened with as much as any, and more than some of them, could well bear. In fact, the landed interest was too much burthened, while another, for the support of which all the others had hitherto been too heavily taxed, was comparatively without any burthen, he meant the monied interest. He would have that interest pay its share by a tax on all income derived from money. He meant not the Funds alone, but on mortgages and other species of annuities, which were almost untaxed, while land was borne down with taxation of every kind. He would suppose a man with an estate of 10,000*l.* a year, of which 5,000*l.* was paid to a mortgagee; this mortgagee received his income without deduction, whatever was the change in the value of land, while the owner of the estate had to pay so many demands in taxes, tithes, and poor-rates, out of the remaining produce of his estate, that he had not a nett income of more than 2,000*l.* a-year. This was an inequality of pressure which ought never to have been inflicted, and ought not now to be continued. The land, therefore, should be relieved from some of its burthens, and they should be transferred to those who were better able to bear them. This was a question which would not be met by economy. Economy was necessary, and would do good as far as it went; but they must go further. They must go back, and alter the system of taxation. The country was called upon to make extra exertion,—to put itself in a firm and imposing attitude,—when they saw that in several of the counties around them there was a disposition to upset all that was near and dear to man. As to what had been said by the noble Duke (Leinster) on the state of Ireland, he would only observe, that in what was passing in that country their Lordships were now reaping the bitter fruits of their own conduct, in having yielded too much to popular clamour. The consequences were now before them in the cry which was raised for a repeal of the Union. He agreed in the opinion that the feeling in favour of that measure was not general in the country, but he could not conceal the fact, that there was in Ireland a growing want of confidence in the Legislature. The consequence partly of the resentment and indignation at the course which his Majesty's Ministers had pursued two Sessions ago, on the important subject then brought forward. It was necessary that this feeling should be removed by the future conduct of the Legislature. As to the Union, he was one of those who, in Ireland, had most strenuously opposed the carrying of that measure. He thought it was unjust, and he knew the base and unconstitutional means which were resorted to to carry it through; but while he said this he must also declare, that to the way in which the repeal of that measure was sought to be brought about, and indeed to the repeal itself, in whatever way it might be proposed to effect it, he was decidedly opposed; because he felt if that measure were carried, it would sever the connexion between the two countries, and tend to the ruin of both. He hoped that the feeling which existed on this subject in the minds of some persons in Ireland would give way to a more rational way of thinking. He hoped, too, that the Legislature would act in such a manner as would tend to create renewed confidence on the part of the people in Ireland, that it would, above all things, shew no indifference with regard to Irish business, no readiness to yield to the language of intimidation, and the agitation for the repeal of the Union would, he was convinced, soon die away.

Earl *Grey* spoke to the following effect:—I feel great satisfaction that I gave way to the two noble Lords who have preceded me, for I have heard, with much pleasure and full concurrence, what fell from the noble Duke behind me; and I heard also, with similar feelings, a considerable portion of what was delivered by the noble Lord who followed him, though differing from that noble Lord in a great many of those observations which he made while addressing himself to the more extended and general question, which the Speech from the Throne has raised for the consideration of your Lordships and the other branch of the Legislature. I entirely agree with the noble Lord who spoke last, that for centuries Parliament has not been called on to deliberate respecting matters of greater importance, or perhaps of greater danger, than now present themselves. They are circumstances which will demand at our hands all the caution—all the wisdom—all the fortitude—that we can possibly exercise. But I have, at the same time, a full confidence that, with the stedfast and honest application of the qualities which have belonged to the English nation and Legislature, those dangers will disappear, and those questions which all men must feel to be of the deepest importance, will be decided in a manner becoming their momentous character, and calculated to avert the dangers by which we are surrounded. I have, I repeat it, the fullest confidence in the good sense, the honourable feeling, and the unabated loyalty of the people of England. I have no doubt, that if both Houses are forced to do their duty, there will be nothing to fear for the safety, honour, and happiness, of the British nation. Had I risen earlier, I perhaps should not have said even so much as may be comprised within the few brief observations which I propose to address to the House, and which I intend to commence, by adverting, in the first place, to that topic which I conceive to be of the very first importance—I mean the state of Ireland. I have no hesitation whatever in adopting, with reference to that condition, the language which your Lordships have this day heard from the Throne. I do partake most fully in those feelings of "grief and indignation" expressed by our most gracious Monarch in reference to those measures which have been adopted in another part of the empire, for the purpose of alienating the affections of a brave and loyal people in a manner that must lead to the separation of the two countries, and finally to the certain destruction of both. Concurring, my Lords, most fully in those sentiments, I need not, I trust, add, that I shall most cordially, as far as my humble means admit, lend my assistance to any proceedings which his Majesty's Ministers may find it necessary to adopt, consistent with the spirit of the sentiments just expressed from the Throne, and in conformity with the fundamental principles of the laws and Constitution of the country. I make this qualification, because, upon the Speech, as it stands, I would desire to rest, the more especially as I find in it no allusion to any new laws. I think the laws as they exist at present, ought to be put in force, and I am deeply impressed with the conviction that they will, if energetically executed, be found abundantly sufficient to meet the present exigency—to accomplish the proper and effectual punishment of those who would divert the subject from his allegiance, and to terminate those animosities and mistaken views of the true interests of that country from which those disturbances take their rise. Regarding, then, the intentions of his Majesty's Government, as I find them this day developed in the Speech from the Throne, I confess I look with great confidence to the course to be followed by the noble Duke behind me (Leinster); I look also with great confidence to the exercise of that sense and discretion which I trust will not be wanting in the sound and influential portion of the people of Ireland; and I sincerely rejoice that that noble Duke, taking the lead which naturally belongs to his great name, and availing himself of the ascendancy which attaches to his station in that country, has put himself at the head of that part of the population of Ireland in which the greatest influence and the soundest judgment may be expected to reside. I rejoice that the noble Duke has put himself at the head of those who have resolved to stem the torrent which, if not energetically and decisively resisted, will lead to the destruction of all that man in a social state could deem worth contending for. I would therefore entreat and exhort the noble Duke to place himself at the head of the sound part of the community, and save the country from those fearful calamities with which others, who seek to divert the people from their allegiance, would inevitably superinduce. But in order to save the country, what is to be done must be done quickly and decisively. In saying all this, however, my Lords, I find it impossible to agree with the noble Lord who spoke last, that circumstances which have recently occurred go at all to fulfil his prophecy of the Session before the last. I can never agree with him, or with any man, that the great and healing measure of that Session could have been productive of any such effects. That measure was one to which I have ever given my most cordial and devoted support through good and through evil report—for the advancement of that measure I made sacrifices of which it does not now become me to speak, for I made them willingly; but I cannot now sit still and hear it said, that it could have led to results which every man in the country, and every lover of the human race must deplore. No, my Lords, the fault, with respect to that measure, was not in the concessions which were made, but in the delay which took place; that which, done early, would have been beneficial, done late lost no small portion of its value; concession was delayed till a system of agitation was established capable of being applied to the basest and the worst of purposes—concession was not made on principles of right or justice, or policy, but confessedly to fear and necessity. Let it not be supposed that I am blaming those by whom the concessions were made—far from it. I do not blame them for giving way, at least I do not blame them for at length carrying that measure themselves which it was the whole business of their previous lives, to resist. In the circumstances in which they found themselves placed, the course they adopted was the evident dictate of sound policy and wisdom; when they saw the danger approaching, they did what then lay in their power to obviate its possible effects. I heard, with feelings which I shall never forget, the noble Duke opposite, when speaking of the horrors of civil war, say, that he was willing to die, to save his country from such a calamity. It was a declaration dictated alike by feelings of humanity and of true wisdom. For reasons, then, my Lords, which these observations naturally suggest, the views I took of that great and healing measure remain unchanged; and to the opinion which I then entertained respecting it, I have now to add, that I am persuaded the degree in which it may have contributed to the present discontents in Ireland is solely to be ascribed, not to the adoption, but to the delay in passing it. We are now, however, to deal with a new state of things, and we must deal with them as we find them; we are to direct our energies to the suppression of that system of agitation as applied to the question of the Union, by which the former question, I am willing to admit, was, in a great measure, advanced—that which we might have borne with as the means of promoting a great and legitimate object, we are called upon to resist when directed to opposite purposes. I hesitate not to affirm, that we are bound to support and promote the efforts of those who think, to dissolve the Union amounts to nothing less than to dissolve the connection between this country and Ireland. I opposed the measure of the Union at the time it was first discussed here, on general policy. I opposed it also on grounds to which the noble Lord who spoke last has adverted—namely, because of the foul means which were adopted for the purpose of carrying that measure into effect. They were means which would provoke opposition to any measure. There were never worse means resorted to, for carrying any measure than the corruption to which I am alluding—they were means which reflect the deepest disgrace upon those with whom they originated, and which, to remotest posterity, will blacken the memory of their authors. Inducements were held out both to Protestants and Catholics, involving opposite representations and statements; the Protestants were told, that if that measure were once passed, it would afford the best security to them against the Catholics; and the Catholics were told, that if they agreed to it, and gave their assistance to forward its accomplishment, their own claims would come to be considered by a free Parliament, unfettered by any restrictions hostile to their just demands. Thus were both parties deceived, that that measure might be carried into effect—the Catholics were deceived, and continued in the degraded condition in which they were left at the Union, until a degree of irritation showed itself, that could no longer be trifled with, and till concession became the only remedy. Would to God that the warning voices of those who are now no more had been listened to; what evils might have been prevented—what dangers might have been averted—what collisions of hostile parties might have been avoided—what strenuous and ardent efforts might have been combined in cordial unity, to extend and consolidate the true interests and happiness of the United Kingdom. But regrets of this nature need now no longer be indulged; the present moment demands some decisive and energetic measures, as respects many relations in which we stand; and I rejoice at being able to say, that I concur with his Majesty's Ministers in thinking, that to execute the existing laws is all that Ireland requires in the nature of restraint. I have, therefore, nothing to object to that part of the Address which relates to Ireland; fully sympathising, as I do, in the grief and indignation which his Majesty has thought proper to express, I the more readily concur in that part of the Address, indeed from a persuasion that his Majesty's Ministers are not, and cannot be, indifferent to the state of Ireland; and I trust that Parliament will soon receive from them proofs that they are ready to bring forward measures suitable to the condition of that country. Once more, in recurring to the great and healing measure of the Session before the last, I beg to repeat that I was never of the number of those who expected from it alone the complete and immediate tranquillity of Ireland—there was much to be done in every department of society in that country—there was much to be done to allay the spirit of discontent which every where prevailed and much to be done to remedy the abuses of the government of Ireland—which were rendered inveterate by long duration. The great measure, however, has been passed, and it now remains for Parliament to follow it up in a manner suitable to such a commencement, by which I should earnestly recommend to the immediate attention of the House—measures of internal relief—measures worthy of the policy which opened the Constitution to the Catholics—measures calculated to remove the poverty and distress of the people, and to give strength to the Government. Having now made the few remarks which I intended to address to the House respecting Ireland, I shall direct my attention to the condition of the empire, but more especially, in the first instance, to the distresses of the people, and to the disturbances to which noble Lords have alluded. I shall begin by admitting, that I believe distress does exist to a considerable extent; and I concur as heartily as any man in the opinion that Parliament should immediately institute an inquiry into the causes of that distress, and without delay adopt such measures as the necessity of the case may demand. When I first read in the newspapers the statement to which a noble Earl behind me has adverted, I hesitated not a moment in pronouncing my disbelief of it. I could not believe that the peasantry of Kent were affected by so bad a spirit, and least of all did I believe that that noble Earl could have been made the subject of hostile feelings by those whom he employed, and who surrounded him as neighbours. However, we have now the statement of the noble Earl himself, which will go forth to the public in such a form as to preclude the continuance of error on that subject. I cannot pass from this part of the subject without expressing my full conviction, that Parliament will direct its best efforts to remedy the evils which have led to this species of disturbance, and though the people of that country have been driven to commit excesses, I trust that their spirit is yet sound, that they have English hearts in their bosoms, and that when they become satisfied that the Legislature is anxiously engaged in devising means for their relief, they will be restored to a sense of what they owe to themselves, and to society. I fully concur in the recommendation of the noble Lord—a recommendation in perfect accordance with his humane feelings and his high courage—that our first duty is, to repress severely and firmly any violation of the law, and immediately to enter upon the consideration of such remedial measures as, under the circumstances, may be practicable. The noble Marquis who moved the Address, seemed to imagine that the distresses in the county of Kent had their origin in events which took place in a neighbouring country. —[The Marquis of Bute denied that he had said any such thing, and the Marquis of Camden said, it was he who had expressed the opinion to which the noble Earl referred.] I beg pardon of the noble Marquis who spoke first—I should have attributed that sentiment to the noble Marquis, the Lord-lieutenant of the county of Kent. I really, however, am quite at a loss to discover the grounds upon which he affirms that those disturbances had their origin in the cause which he assigns. I am unable to comprehend why such causes should have affected Kent at all, and, having done so, why their operation should be confined to that county; neither can I understand how the destruction of machinery is at all connected with causes of that nature. The destruction of machinery by labourers is clearly to be attributed to the distress, as they cannot be persuaded that their distresses are not aggravated by its means. But the other outrages which disgrace the county of Kent cannot be so accounted for. They are in all respects contrary to all that we have ever known of the English character. Nor are they occasioned by the occurrences in a neighbouring nation, to which the noble Marquis has referred. The next topic to which I must allude respects the professions of economy contained in the Speech of this day. Of these professions I must say, that they are invariably made in Speeches from the

Throne, but I hope that, on the present occasion at least, they will be carried into effect. I trust the relief which it is intended to give will be such as to remove the pressure of those taxes, which are at the same time the most severely felt and the least productive. Allusion has been made to what was done in the last Session of Parliament. For those measures of relief, as far as they went, I give his Majesty's Ministers full credit; although I do not think that the taxes repealed were those of which the pressure was the most felt or the most general. But in another respect this repeal has been productive of good. In the expense of their collection, the saving has been as great as in the productive amount of the taxes themselves. But more general relief might have been afforded by the repeal of other taxes; though I have no doubt that the selection of taxes to be repealed was made with the best intentions. What I now look for is a still further reduction. I do not, however, think this a time to discuss such a proposition as that brought forward by the noble Lord on the cross-bench, respecting a different mode of taxation. If the noble Lord means to propose a Property-tax, it will be my duty to give the most decided opposition to such a tax, because I feel that it will increase not lessen our difficulties. On another occasion I shall have an opportunity of pointing out such taxes as, by their repeal, would at the same time afford the most general relief, and diminish to the greatest amount the expenses of collection. As to the measure recommended by his Majesty to the consideration of Parliament—namely, the appointment of a Regency—it is one which I, in common with other noble Lords, urged your Lordships to consider in the last Session. Of that measure I have now nothing to say, but that I entirely concur in the recommendation contained in his Majesty's Speech, and I have no objection to make to the manner in which it has been introduced; I can have no wish but that an arrangement may be made that will ensure on the one hand, the unity and efficiency of the Government, as well as the rights and liberties of the subject, during the minority of the successor to the Throne, and on the other hand, the safe succession of the minor, placing the guardianship in those hands which nature and good policy point out. With respect to the next topic alluded to, I have no objection to consider it, as recommended by the noble Marquis who introduced the Address. It is true, as the noble Marquis has stated, that the Speech is understood to contain the sentiments of his Majesty's Ministers. I am also willing to consider the recommendation as to the hereditary revenues of the Crown, as the act of his Majesty himself; and as adding to those many acts of spontaneous generosity and sincere affection for his subjects which have already gained for his Majesty the hearts of his people. His Majesty deserved the praise in the first instance of the measure; but I will also give his Majesty's Ministers credit for their readiness to bring forward such measures as are most likely to contribute to the prosperity of the empire and to the security of the Crown. I gratefully acknowledge, with the noble Marquis, the considerate disposition in his Majesty which has induced him to resign wholly to Parliament all those hereditary revenues such as the Droits of Admiralty, the West-India Duties, and other branches of casual revenue which belonged to the Crown. But, my Lords, from the way in which the noble Marquis has stated the matter, it would appear, that he supposes those revenues to be the private property of the Crown, and that the Sovereign has a right to employ them as he pleases, without reference to public utility. Against any such construction it is my duty to protest. Those revenues were originally given to enable his Majesty to carry on the government of the country with dignity and effect; and Parliament in contributing to the expenses of the Civil List, is bound only to grant so much as may supply the deficiency of those other sources of revenue. I do not mention this, my Lords, with any view to detract from the great condescention of his Majesty, but to prevent an incorrect principle, such as that stated by the noble Marquis, from being adopted by the House. I have now, my Lords, gone through all the topics of the Speech which relate to our domestic concerns, and I must proceed to not the least important, though the least noticed, part of his Majesty's Speech. My Lords, I allude to that part of the Speech from the Throne in which our doubtful relations with other Powers are spoken of. I agree with the noble Lord on the cross-bench (Lord Farnham) as to the necessity of preparations: but I do not agree with him in supposing that there is any necessity for Parliament to consider preparations for taking up arms. I do not look for defence to augmented establishments—to an increased army and navy—being convinced that such precautions will bring upon us the very dangers which we seek, by their adoption, to avoid. If we were to arm, as the noble Lord has intimated we should, and, as he said, all Europe was arming, if we were to adopt such a policy, in all probability one short month would not pass without our being involved in a war with France. "You see," said the noble Lord, the "danger around you; the storm is in the horizon, but the hurricane approaches. Begin then at once to strengthen your houses, to secure your windows, and to make fast your doors." But the mode in which this must be done, my Lords, is by securing the affections of your fellow-subjects, and by redressing their grievances, and—my Lords, I will pronounce the word—by reforming Parliament. Through my whole life I have advocated Reform, and I have thought that, if it were not attended to in time, the people would lose all confidence in Parliament, and we must make up our minds to witness the destruction of the Constitution. I trust that it will not be put off as the Catholic Question was put off, but considered in time, so that measures may be introduced by which gradual Reform can be effected without danger to the institutions of the country. Whether it can be expected that Ministers will bring forward such measures, I cannot say; but of this I am sure, that if they do not bring them forward, and carry them into effect, they will in time be pressed by this question as they have been pressed by the question of Catholic Emancipation, and compelled to yield to expediency what they refuse to concede upon principle. Perhaps, in the early part of my life, I have urged this question with the rashness of youth; but I have never thought that Reform should be insisted on as a matter of popular right, nor have I ever advocated the principle of universal suffrage, which, on the contrary, has always seemed to me to be inconsistent with our institutions. We are now told, that every man who pays taxes has a right to participate in the choice of Members of the Legislature; we are told more than that—we are told that every man who contributes to the wealth of the country by his labour has a right to vote; we are told, indeed, that every man who has arrived at a full age is entitled to this privilege. These are principles which I must deny, and claims which I must oppose. The right of the people is to good government; and that is, in my judgment, inconsistent with universal suffrage under our present institutions. If suffrage be the right of all who pay a certain tax, then I say, that it is in the limit, and not in the extension, of that privilege, that such right consists. I say, my Lords, that preparation ought to be made to revise the Constitution, to extend its blessings, and to secure the affection of the people, to ensure their tranquillity, and to confirm their confidence in the Legislature, and in a King who only lives for the good of his subjects. But I do not agree in the policy recommended by the noble Lord on the cross-bench (Lord Farnham). With respect to France, I approve of all that has hitherto occurred, although no one will say that I would hold out inducements to rebellion. My Lords, I know that all Revolutions are evils in themselves, and I regret that what has passed was necessary. For the peace of Europe, for the honour and safety of the family which has been expelled from the Throne, I regret that Charles 10th could not have made up his mind to concur in the new order of things, to act faithfully upon the Charter which he had sworn to maintain, and to acknowledge the right of the people to that good government, without which, tranquillity and allegiance cannot be expected from them. My Lords, if Revolution could be rendered necessary in any circumstances, it was rendered necessary by what I must call an unjustifiable attack on the liberties of the people. As an Englishman, owing the benefits which I at present enjoy to a similar measure, similarly provoked, I rejoice in the resistance of the people of France to the attack upon their liberties; and I rejoice in the character of their whole conduct, from the first moment when resistance became necessary to the expulsion of the reigning family. In such a cause resistance was necessary, was noble, and I cannot conceive a more heart-stirring scene than that of a people entering upon so holy a contest with courage worthy of the cause, and using victory, when achieved, with such unparalleled moderation. It is gratifying, that in their resistance, there has not yet been one act to stain the purity of their patriotism. In the Revolution which has been forced on them, no blood has yet been shed which the violence of the tyrants themselves did not render necessary. God grant that their conduct may continue to be as stainless. I believe there is no friend to liberty in Europe who would not be gratified if mercy were extended even to the authors of those measures by which the Revolution was provoked; but if it be necessary to proceed in the work of justice, every friend to freedom hopes that nothing will be done to raise a suspicion that punishment has been dictated by a thirst of vengeance. The justice of the cause of the people was proved by the moderation of their conduct; I trust, therefore, that what has been so happily begun will proceed in the same spirit. I cordially approve of the ready manner in which Ministers recognized the new government, and I hope therefore that by the union of the two countries, holding their liberties by the same means and on the same principles the peace of Europe will be maintained. The allusions of his Majesty's Speech to the affairs of the Netherlands occasion some exception to the satisfaction which I have received from other passages. The principle of our benevolence to those States should be that of non-interference. I confess that I cannot understand that we are bound to interfere in any arrrangements of a local nature between Holland and the Low Countries. If I have not misunderstood the noble Marquis in the speech which he made—with, I suppose, a knowledge of the intentions of his Majesty's Ministers—he has said, that we are interested in maintaining and are bound to maintain the kingdom of the Netherlands in the situation in which it has been settled by Treaties to which this country is a party; I cannot understand that we are so bound. As for those Treaties themselves, I do not think that they have contributed to the tranquillity of Europe; nor do I think that acting on them now would contribute to its prosperity and peace. Instead of acting on the principle of the balance of Europe, which would protect the weak against the strong, we have departed from that principle, and formed alliances upon principles of confiscation and division, in accordance with which we have transferred one kingdom to another, without regard to the sentiments or to the interests of those who were transferred. From the first moment, those transfers have never allowed to Europe an hour's security. No man can more regret than I do the separation of Flanders from Holland: and in this view I cannot disapprove of the intimation conveyed in his Majesty's Speech, if the mediation alluded to be conducted in a proper manner, in concert with France, so as to effect a new and amicable settlement of the country. But I imagine that, after the excitement of the animosities which now actuate the inhabitants of the two countries, they cannot again be united but by means the most vicious and unjust, and by an utter disregard of the principle on which it is the duty of every country to act—that is, the principle of non-interference. I should certainly be happy to see those two countries identified under one government, but I cannot imagine that this can now be effected by any means short of a force capable of overwhelming the resisting party, and against the employment of such a force, I for one, shall always strongly protest. These are my views; and they are enforced with a reasoning more powerful than I am capable of advancing, in a letter addressed to a noble friend of mine, dated 19th May, 1818, from which I shall, with your Lordships' permission, read an extract:—

"*Netherlands.*—The only change of importance which Lord Castlereagh made in the project sketched by Mr. Pitt, in 1805, was, to give the Netherlands to Holland instead of Prussia. Whether the original plan was a good one may be doubted; but the merit of the alteration is still more equivocal. A proposition of joining the Netherlands to Holland was made to William 3rd, but he rejected it, says Burnet, on account of the difference of religious opinions; and he seems to have acted with his usual knowledge and judgment. The Belgians require their government to be strictly Roman Catholic and intolerant; the Dutch wish no less for a Protestant King and general toleration. Nor is this the only difference—the Belgians wish the land to be free from taxes, the Dutch will hear of no duties upon commerce. The Belgians are accustomed to the use of the French language; the Dutch will not be governed except in Dutch. The Belgians despise the Dutch as a covetous, unpolished, unfeeling people; the Dutch despise the Belgians as an ignorant, stupid, and bigotted race. The Belgians, in fact, wish to return to the French government, and in the scramble for the patronage of the combined Crown, they are not able to contend with the superior ability and information of their neighbours. In 1816, of eight Ministers of State, only one was a Belgian; of twenty-eight diplomatic agents, one; of eighty-five Generals, sixteen, &c.; so that of 169 of the first employments of government, the Belgians had only thirty Add to this that the Belgians are obliged to pay taxes for the interest of the Dutch debt, and the repairs of the Dutch dykes. It may easily be believed, that amongst the discontents which this arrangement has occasioned, the government cannot hold a very steady course. The sovereign authority is exercised, neither with the youthful vigour of a new, nor the prescriptive majesty of an old government. And what shall we say to this limited Monarchy, in which the King, by his first act, abolished Trial by Jury, and named his own Chamber of Deputies? Or to a Parliament, of which the members rail at one another in different languages? Where a Belgian deputy, who proposes a financial question, is completely foiled by the unintelligible reply of a Dutch Chancellor of the Exchequer? Where one half of the House do not understand the other half till they see their speeches translated in the newspaper of the following day? If the internal government of this country wants stability, its external situation is not more secure. Flanders, said Sir William Temple, is not of a size to support a large army, nor of a figure to be defended by a small one. The union with Holland has not added much to its military strength. The Dutch force is chiefly naval, and the Colonies require a large number of troops. The present army of the kingdom consists of 40,000 regulars, and 60,000 militia. Even with the additions which may be made in the time of war, they will not be more than sufficient to garrison the fortresses. If the French were to invade Belgium, it would be utterly impossible for the king of the Netherlands to meet them with an army in the field. Austria and Spain would no longer empty their treasures to support Flanders. The only power from which money and men could be expected would be England. So that, after paying to build the fortresses, we should have to pay for defending them—perhaps, too, against the inhabitants. We have here an instance of two nations, possessing no natural attraction, but rather a very great repulsion, to each other, pounded together in the great mortar of the chemists of Vienna. What is to result from the mixture of two equal parts of Catholic bigotry and Protestant freedom—of land and commerce—of French and Dutch—of polished stupidity and vulgar talent—of natural servility and ancient love of freedom, no man can guess. It may be supposed, however, that one of the parts will fly off as soon as it can join any foreign matter. And this is the kingdom which is considered by all foreigners as raised out of deference to England, at the special demand of Lord Castlereagh!"

My Lords, from the considerations expressed in that extract, I object to the manner in which the allusion to Belgium is introduced in the Address. If it went no further than to lament the unhappy occurrence in that country, I should not offer any objection to its adoption in our answer to his Majesty's Speech. But it makes us go further. We are made to decide between the two parties, and to pronounce a direct censure on the conduct of the people of the Low Countries towards their enlightened government. This is language directly opposed to the principle of non-interference. We speak of the Belgians as "revolted subjects;" and as revolted subjects, they would be considered to deserve punishment. Is the noble Duke, then, prepared to bring matters to this issue? If he be so, I trust this House will not sanction such interference. What, then, will he do, should he be compelled to leave them as they are? If, after this judgment upon the conduct of the two parties, he should become a mediator, can he expect to be considered impartial? Would he not naturally be looked upon as the enemy of one of the parties to whom he should offer himself to settle their disputes? But should the transactions in Belgium come to the issue, which I think not only the most likely, but, perhaps, the most desirable, at present, for the interest of this country—should Belgium, I say, be formed into an independent State, in what relation shall we stand to that country, to which we, this night, in the language of the Address, express our hostility? Against that expression I feel bound, my Lords, to protest, as impolitic and unjust; and I believe that, if the Duke apply to France for her co-operation in interference, on the principles implied in that part of the

Address, he will find France soon falling-off from the negotiation, and his measure leading to the result which it is his wish to avoid. My Lords, it was also with regret that I heard the allusion made to the recognition of Don Miguel. I do not wish to speak here of the private character of that Prince, but I do not think the proposed recognition of his authority in Portugal consistent with a Statesman-like view of our relations with that country. Our original situation, certainly, with respect to Don Miguel, was by no means the same as at present. We have lately recognised a new government in France, and as there seems to be in the other country (Portugal) also a government, existing now for some time, with the apparent concurrence of the people, I am not prepared to say when it may be proper to recognise it. But in the passage of the Speech from the Throne, alluding to such recognition, there is something which I do not understand. The recognition is made to depend on the passing of an amnesty. I understood the noble Duke at the head of his Majesty's Government to have said, on a former occasion, when he wished to justify a measure which was complained of in this House, that "non-interference was the principle, and intervention the exception." Now, I will ask him, how he can reconcile that principle of non-interference with making this amnesty the condition of the proposed recognition of Don Miguel? If he do so, is he prepared to enforce the fulfilment of that condition? For my part, my Lords, I should certainly rejoice to see the Marquis of Palmella and his virtuous fellow-sufferers restored to their country and to their estates; but, I must ask the noble Duke, if this amnesty be made the condition on which we recognise Don Miguel —and if, on the faith of that condition, the noble Duke's companions in arms, who are now engaged in attempting to establish the liberty of Spain, should return to their own country, would this promise of Don Miguel be faithfully observed? If faith be not kept with the returned exiles—if Palmella and the others be seized on their return, what then will follow? Are we bound to maintain the amnesty, to the promise of which we are made a party? Are we bound to go to war for the purpose of enforcing it? Such interference is opposed to all the principles on which nations have ever acted. As yet we have seen nothing to encourage the expectation of this amnesty. On the contrary, the last that we have heard of the proceedings of that Prince (Don Miguel), was his seizure of the wives and children of those adherents of Donna Maria who were not accompanied in exile by their families. Before I conclude, I should wish, with your Lordships' indulgence, to recapitulate by stating, that in respect to what has happened in France, I rejoice in the successful resistance of the people to the unjustifiable measures of the family which they have expelled; I trust, into whatever negotiations his Majesty's Government may resolve to engage for the new settlement of Belgium, that the principle of non-interference will be strictly adhered to. I regret the distress—the existence of which in this country cannot be denied, and I am satisfied that this House is disposed to consider the best means of relieving it. With respect to Ireland, I concur altogether in the sentiments expressed by the noble Duke who sits near me; and although, under all circumstances, I cannot give my sanction to the Address, I conceive that I fulfil my duty in offering it no opposition.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, he was in hopes, judging from the first part of the noble Earl's Speech, that he should only have had to congratulate their Lordships on the sentiments which the noble Earl had delivered in commenting on his Majesty's speech, and what had fallen from the noble Lord and the noble Duke. The sentiments of the noble Earl did him the highest honour, and became the rank which he ought to hold in the country as a statesman. They did equal honour to his heart and head, and he (the Duke of Wellington) congratulated the House on their expression, at the same time that he was sorry he could not agree with what had fallen from the noble Earl upon all the points he had touched upon. The noble Earl ended his speech with some observations relative to Portugal, and he would commence by answering them. He begged the House to recollect how frequently his late Majesty had stated to Parliament the inconvenience felt in this country, in consequence of the interruption of our diplomatic relations with Portugal; how frequently his late Majesty had stated his wish to re-establish those relations; how anxiously he sought to reconcile the two branches of the House of Braganza; and how frequently, as he repeatedly told the

House, he had negociated on the subject. Having failed in his negotiations to bring about the desired union, his Majesty adopted other measures, with a view to remove the difficulties of the case, and benefit his subjects; and the Royal Speech informed the House, that there were now hopes of effecting these objects at an early opportunity. As long as there existed a government in Portugal, keeping a large portion of the talent and property of the kingdom in a state of exile, his Majesty could not recognize a government so circumstanced, without endangering our safety and honour. An amnesty, therefore, which would permit the return of the exiled party, and guarantee their security, had been long recommended, and the government of Portugal at length intending to carry it into effect, his Majesty conceived the great difficulty to be removed, and had expressed his intention to recognize that government. The noble Earl said, "Shall we be bound to go to war to carry into execution that amnesty?" That did not follow by any means, and the noble Earl would see, from the expressions used in his Majesty's Speech, and from the observations he had submitted to their Lordships, that we should not be bound to go to war in order to carry into effect any part of the engagement. We should be bound to interfere, in every possible way short of actual war, to prevent a violation of the amnesty. Such an interference was very different in its nature from the designs referred to by the noble Earl, and was perfectly justifiable. Although the noble Earl did not approve of the recognition of the Portuguese government, and of the renewal of our diplomatic relations with that country, he was glad to find that the noble Earl approved of the measures adopted by this Government with respect to France, and he begged to assure the House, in answer to what the noble Lord said, questioning whether or not it was our intention to proceed in the same spirit as we had begun, and carry into execution the arrangements with France with good faith, that these arrangements never would have been made if it was not intended to carry them faithfully into effect. When the Government of this country saw the new government of France established, his Majesty had not the slightest hesitation in acknowledging the new order of things, and he sincerely hoped that such arrangements would be made, in addition to those already made, as would conduce to the welfare and best interests of that country, and the lasting peace and tranquillity of Europe. The noble Earl had thought proper to find fault with the expressions used in the Speech with reference to the government of the king of the Netherlands; and the noble Earl observed, that his Majesty's Ministers had not mentioned one single subject of complaint made by the people of the Netherlands to their sovereign, though those complaints had appeared in a pamphlet which was published some years ago, and had become matters of history, and were well known to the king. But though this were the case, was his Majesty,—the ally, the close ally of the king of the Netherlands,—in speaking of the government of that sovereign, to mention what had occurred among his subjects as anything but a revolt against his authority? How could his Majesty do otherwise than treat the convulsions which had taken place in the territory of his close and near ally, but as a revolt against his legal and established government? The noble Lord had no doubt read, in the daily publications, the full history of the transactions. They commenced, it was well known, in nothing but a riot. The troops were eventually overpowered by those who had revolted, under the pretence of putting down that riot, and for which purpose they had ostensibly armed themselves, though they eventually turned their arms against the royal authority. The complaints of the revolters against the king of the Netherlands were, in the first instance, absolutely nothing. Of what did they complain? The first object they found fault with was the union of the two countries, and the existence in the administration of the government of a person named Van Maanen, who, however, was actually out of office at the time when the complaints against him were made. The other complaints were of supposed or real grievances, of a partial nature, and the result of local regulations. In fact, it was very well known,—and he appealed to every noble Lord who heard him, whether he was not correct in saying it,—that no complaint whatever was made against the king of the Netherlands personally, or against his administration of the government, or (with one exception) against those to whom he had confided the functions of official duties, until the revolters had attained a certain degree of success, and began to aim at what, in the first instance, they had not contemplated. What, then, he again asked, was his Majesty the king of England, in speaking of his ally, to enter into these complaints, or would it have been proper in him to have even alluded to the subject? He could not hesitate to say, that such a course would in every respect have been unadvisable. And he would ask, what did the king of the Netherlands do upon his receiving these complaints? Had he not pursued the strict course pointed out to him by the constitution of the country? and had he not subsequently acted in rigid conformity to his relations with other Powers? Immediately the complaints were made known to him, the King had assembled the States General: he had assembled that body in which was constitutionally vested the right and power to remedy the grievances complained of by a portion of his subjects. He proposed as a question for their consideration, what were termed the greatest grievances,—namely, the union between the two parts of the country: he laid before them the wish of one portion of his subjects to dissolve that union, as far as the administration of the government was concerned; and finally, he proposed to them the question of revoking certain laws that were obnoxious to his subjects. Would his Majesty the king of England have done common justice to his ally, the king of the Netherlands,—did justice from one friendly Sovereign to another require that he should not assume that his conduct, previously to the revolt, had been that of a wise and good sovereign, and that he wished to adopt the most effectual measures to remedy the grievances complained of? What his Majesty the king of England had said, was merely that he lamented that those measures had not produced satisfactory results. The noble Lord, after commenting upon the Speech from the Throne, and upon what he conceived were the views of his Majesty's Government, had asked, was it possible that the Government of England could be a just and impartial mediator, when it had, in fact, pronounced a sentence against one of the parties? He would say, that even the parties themselves could not and would not deny the fact which he had just stated, nor would they dispute the correctness of the interpretation which he put upon his Majesty's Speech from the Throne. The Belgians did, in point of fact, revolt, and that is what his Majesty said in his Speech. He would add nothing further upon this topic, but proceed to another part of the noble Lord's speech, in which he alluded to the treaties by which this country was bound in her relations to the Netherlands. The first was the Treaty of Peace signed by the Allied Powers in the year 1814, and by which the provinces, commonly called Belgium, were conceded and agreed to be joined to the united provinces of Holland, with a view to form a sovereignty under the government of the king of the Netherlands. In consequence of this Treaty of 1814, arrangements were made for the government of the Netherlands, under the king of Holland, by each of the four Powers which had made the Treaty with France. It was well known to the noble Lord that this arrangement was recorded in the treaty of the Eight Articles, and that this Treaty referred to the fundamental laws of the government of the United Provinces, which were to be made applicable to the whole kingdom. There could be no doubt whatever that the four contracting Powers were bound by that Treaty in the present case. It made over to the King of the Netherlands the whole of Belgium, who received it according to the arrangements of that Treaty, by which all parties were to be strictly bound. Could it be contended that any thing which had since occurred, or that any thing in the present position of affairs, could alter the obligations or destroy the powers of that Treaty? Subsequently to the arrangements of which he had been speaking, the Treaty had been made a matter of record, and a basis of negotiation in the acts of the Congress at Vienna, and in fact, the acts of the treaty of the Eight Articles was an appendix to the Treaty of Vienna, to which the King of France became a contracting party. The Treaty had, therefore, received every possible sanction and ratification, and France had become a party to all the arrangements under it which referred to the kingdom of the Netherlands. Notwithstanding this, it had been said, that the king of the Netherlands could dissolve this union between the two parts of his kingdom of himself, and without consulting those who made the Treaty, or desiring their consent to the dissolution. There could be no doubt whatever that the five Powers which had signed the Treaty of Vienna, would claim their indisputable right to give their opinion upon the future explanation of the articles. England could not attempt to pacify the parties alone. France could not singly make the attempt; nor could any other Power use an effort to pacify or reconcile existing differences alone; the object must be attempted by all the parties in concert, and that concert, whatever the arrangements were, must include France. That there were difficulties in the way of effecting a pacification he did not deny, but he hoped to get the better of them. He could assure the House that there was no intention whatever on the part of his Majesty's Ministers—that there was not the slightest intention on the part of any Power whatever—to interfere by means of arms with the arrangements respecting the Netherlands. The desire of his Majesty, and of every other party concerned, was to settle, if possible, every point by means of negotiation, and by negotiation alone. He hoped that the negotiations between the different Powers would make arrangements, as stated in the Speech, which would be compatible with the welfare of both parties in the kingdom of the Netherlands, and conducive to the general safety of Europe. Before, however, he finished with this subject, he must beg to make one observation upon a very extraordinary assertion made by the noble Earl. The noble Earl had said, that the Treaty of Peace of 1814 had not tended to secure, which was its object, the general tranquillity of Europe, but to lay the foundation of future wars. Unfortunately for the noble Lord's assertion, as far as experience had as yet proved the effects of the Treaty, directly the reverse had been the case. Since the Treaty of 1814, there had been the longest general peace, he believed, ever known in Europe—a peace of sixteen years, uninterrupted only by the return of Buonaparte from Elba in 1815. This would show, that by common conciliation and management, the country would get over the present difficulties as it had got over others; and the course necessary to pursue was, to make the general interests of the different Powers of Europe compatible with the good government and welfare of their people. He should now come to a part of the noble Earl's speech to which he confessed he adverted with considerable pain, because it broached a discussion which he had hoped might have been avoided till a future period. The noble Lord upon the cross-bench (Farnham) had been pleased to refer to a discussion of a former period, and to connect it with the present state of Ireland, of which he seemed disposed to make an immediate question. The noble Earl had given colour in some degree to the noble Lord's statements with respect to the influence of this country upon the state of affairs in Ireland. With respect to the repeal of the Union, he would only observe, that that repeal was objected to in the strongest manner by the noble Duke opposite: it was objected to by all the noble Duke's friends in Ireland; it was objected to by all the landed proprietors of Ireland, by a very great majority of Roman Catholics, and by nearly all the Protestants of Ireland; and it was opposed by the unanimous voice of that House, and equally by the unanimous voice of the other, with, perhaps, only one exception. That was the case at present, but what would have been the case if the great measure of emancipation, to which the noble Lord had alluded, had not been carried? The House well knew that a vast majority of the people of every class in Ireland had desired to see the Catholics restored to all their civil rights. The House well knew that a great majority of its Members, as well as a great majority of the other House, had been equally desirous of effecting that object: it well knew that the great majority of the young and growing intellect of the country had ardently wished for the measure, and would any noble Lord now contend, that the Government did not stand on firmer and better ground, with respect to the Union, than if the Catholic Question had not been carried? He, therefore, really did not see the advantage of repeating against him the reproach of his having given way upon that question from motives of fear. He denied that he had been influenced, even in the slightest degree, by any such motive. He had given way, if it could be termed given way, solely because the interests of the country required it. He had urged the question upon views of policy, and expediency, and of justice; upon these grounds he now justified the measure; and upon these grounds he ever would defend his conduct. The noble Lord must forgive him for saying that much of the present state of Ireland must be attributed to the manner in which the Catholic Question had been opposed; whereas the noble Lord would lay all the evils of Ireland to the conduct of Government. The Government had done every thing in its power to conciliate and appease the people of that country, and to heal those passions and lessen the divisions by which they had been distracted previously to the successful termination of the Catholic Question. It was not his duty, and it was far from his inclination to cast imputations upon any man, but still he was bound in fairness to say, that if his Majesty's Government had been properly supported upon that question—if it had been supported as vehemently as it had been opposed—if in its efforts to heal the divisions of Ireland it had not been thwarted—that country would now have been in a very different state. The noble Lord and the noble Duke had complained of the excessive poverty of Ireland. No man, either in that country or in this, could be more painfully aware than he was of the extreme poverty of the Irish, and of the great inconvenience and danger to the empire, resulting from the deplorable state of the lower orders,—no person could be more sensible of all this than he who had the honour of addressing the House; but he must beg the noble Lord to reflect, that it was not by coming to that House, and by talking to their Lordships of the poverty of the people, that the poor could be relieved, or that the evils resulting from that poverty could be remedied. If they wished to tranquillize Ireland, the way was, to persuade those who had money to buy estates and settle in that country, and to employ their capital in its improvement. By transferring capital to Ireland, and exciting industry there, they would soon change the state of the case. If persons of estate and property in that country would reside in it and spend their incomes there, they would do more to tranquillize it than all the measures which his Majesty's Ministers could adopt. He would now advert to a part of the discussion of that night, in allusion to a portion of his Majesty's Speech, upon a subject which gave him very great pain, he alluded to the state of the public mind in a certain part of the kingdom, and the outrages there committed. He certainly could not help agreeing with a noble Marquis (Camden) who had spoken early in the debate, that the outrages of which that county had been the scene, were not to be attributed to distress; for at a period when the population of the country had unquestionably been exposed to greater severities of condition such scenes of outrage had not taken place. He should imagine that the outrages were carried on by two different classes of people. Some of the offences had been committed by a class which was always disposed to break machines, which they thought (and certainly rightly thought) would, in the first instance, throw them out of work, although they did not see that, eventually, machinery created an additional demand for labour and bettered the condition of the labourer. But he was sorry to say that there was another class of persons who burnt and destroyed property without any visible motive whatever. Of what were the causes of these recent outrages, however, the Ministers knew no more than the gentry and magistracy of the county had told them. They were doing every thing in their power to help the gentry and magistrates of the county to discover the causes, and they were giving them every assistance they required to put the law in force, snd to put down the disturbances as quickly as possible. This subject brought him to what noble Lords had said respecting the putting the country in a state to overcome the evils likely to result from the late disturbances in France. The noble Earl had alluded to the propriety of effecting Parliamentary Reform. The noble Earl had, however, been candid enough to acknowledge that he was not prepared with any measure of reform, and he could have no scruple in saying that his Majesty's Government was as totally unprepared with any plan as the noble Lord. Nay, he, on his own part, would go further, and say, that he had never read or heard of any measure up to the present moment which could in any degree satisfy his mind that the state of the representation could be improved, or be rendered more satisfactory to the country at large than at the present moment. He would not, however, at such an unseasonable time, enter upon the subject, or excite discussion, but he should not hesitate to declare unequivocally what were his sentiments upon it. He was fully convinced that the country possessed at the present moment a Legislature which answered all the good purposes of legislation, and this to a greater degree than any Legislature ever had answered in any country whatever. He would go further and say, that the Legislature and the system of representation possessed the full and entire confidence of the country—deservedly possessed that confidence—and the discussions in the Legislature had a very great influence over the opinions of the country. He would go still further and say, that if at the present moment he had imposed upon him the duty of forming a Legislature for any country, and particularly for a country like this, in possession of great property of various descriptions, he did not mean to assert that he could form such a Legislature as they possessed now, for the nature of man was incapable of reaching such excellence at once; but his great endeavour would be, to form some description of legislature which would produce the same results. The representation of the people at present contained a large body of the property of the country, and in which the landed interests had a preponderating influence. Under these circumstances, he was not prepared to bring forward any measure of the description alluded to by the noble Lord. He was not only not prepared to bring forward any measure of this nature, but he would at once declare that as far as he was concerned, as long as he held any station in the government of the country, he should always feel it his duty to resist such measures when proposed by others.

The Address was agreed to, *nem. con.*, and on the Motion of the Duke of Wellington, it was ordered that the House should go up with it, and present it to his Majesty on the following day.

On the Motion of the Duke of Wellington, the Earl of Shaftesbury was appointed Chairman of the Committees of Privileges, and of Committees on Public and such Private Bills as should be committed in the House. The noble Duke took that occasion to bear testimony to the great ability and industry with which the Earl of Shaftesbury had discharged the duties of these situations on former occasions.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, November 2.

The Speaker was summoned at two o'clock to the House of Lords, for the purpose of hearing his Majesty's Speech delivered from the Throne. Accompanied by about 200 Members, he proceeded to the House of Lords, and on his return intimated his intention to take the Chair at three o'clock in order to allow Members to be sworn, and that public business would be proceeded with at four o'clock.—At four o'clock accordingly,

Sir Robert Peel moved the first reading of the Clandestine Outlawries Bill.

Bill read a first time.

[It is usual, in order to preserve the privilege of the Commons, to do whatever business they please before taking the King's Speech into consideration, to move some unimportant measure, which this Bill is.]

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.] The usual Sessional Orders were read.

On the Motion that they be agreed to,

Mr. *Brougham* said, he could not allow the opportunity which that question presented, to pass over without giving notice of his intention, on that day fortnight, to bring the great question of a Reform of the Commons House of Parliament fully under consideration. He thought it right to take the opportunity which that notice gave him, to disavow, in the most solemn and deliberate manner, certain plans of Parliamentary Reform which had lately and sedulously, without any good motive that he could ascertain, been ascribed to him. Those plans, and all the plans of a limited, and bounded nature of reform, of which only he was said to be disposed to be the advocate, he begged now fully to say, were not his, but quite the contrary. At the time he formerly alluded to the subject, he had distinctly stated when they were said to be in contemplation, that they had his assent; but he qualified that assent by declaring that he looked to them merely as part and parcel of that larger and more satisfactory change in the representation, which had become so imperatively necessary. In the next place, he begged to deny a report put forth from a quarter very opposite to that of the other, namely, that he was disposed to favour that radical sweeping kind of reformation which he conscientiously believed must ultimately end in something little short of revolution. On the contrary, he had distinctly stated that he intended to bottom his reform on the ancient days of the Constitution of this country, as exhibited in the plan of its representative system. Without entering into details which he felt would be at that time both irregular and inconvenient, he would merely state, that the whole of his plan would be found to be one of conciliation, so as to combine all interests and all opinions in favour of a restoration of the Constitution to its state of original purity. He was desirous of obtaining the consent of all classes and of all interests, and of all opinions, and of all who were disposed to go even the shortest way with him in the course which he proposed, and to repulse none who might be willing to admit, that there were good reasons to believe the representative system was in want of some reformation; for it was reform, not change, that he had in contemplation. He had only to add, without detaining the House any longer, that he intended to employ the interval, between that time and the day of his bringing forward his Motion, in communicating diligently with all those who held opinions of different degrees on the subject, in order that he might, as far as in him lay, secure the co-operation and support of all who were interested in the great questions which it embraced. One word, however, he thought it now necessary to add, with respect to the principle of his measure and that was, to repeat his declaration, that his object was not revolution but restoration—to restore the representation to that state in which it ought to be, not to change it from what it had been—to repair, not to pull down.

Sessional Orders adopted.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO THE KING'S SPEECH.] The Speaker informed the House that he had procured a copy of the King's Speech, to prevent mistakes; and he would read it, for the satisfaction of the House.

On the Speech being read,—[*for which see ante, p.* 1315.]

Lord *Grimstone* rose to move an Address to the Crown in answer to the Royal Speech. In rising to address such an Assembly, under the circumstances in which he was placed, he could only rely for indulgence on the kind feeling of the House, and on the courtesy of those Members in particular, who, having preceded him on similar occasions, knew the embarrassment incidental to so novel a situation. At the same time, he was aware that a cause like that confided to his hands ought not to suffer from the inadequacy of his talents for the performance of the task. The accession of the Sovereign at a period so pregnant with great events abroad and at home, presented matter for interesting reflection, and the personal character of that Sovereign, together with the tenor of his Speech, he might add, were of a nature to call for congratulation. The settlement of a Regency, as suggested by the Royal Speech, was a delicate subject of discussion, but the terms of the recommendation sufficiently indicated the extent to which his Majesty's confidence was reposed in their fidelity and judgment: it was for them to show that his confidence was not misplaced. Of such a Monarch, he trusted it was not too much to say, that he was liberal in his principles, kind in temper, and condescending in disposition, that he rejoiced, not in the unsubstantial pageantry of a Throne, but in the happiness of his people; and that he ever considered how he should best maintain the essential spirit of the Constitution, which inculcated liberty to all, injury to none. It was impossible to view without regret the affairs of France, a country in alliance with ourselves, which, after having accomplished a revolution, accompanied by fewer evils than are usually attendant on such a crisis, still continued unsatisfied and discontented, to the deep injury of the commercial interests of this country in so far as they were connected with those of our neighbour and ally. The Belgian States, it was to be lamented, exhibited even greater horrors than those of which France had been the theatre, having rebelled and levied war against their King, who was ready to make any concessions in their favour which they could reasonably demand. Nevertheless, although no amicable termination to these dissensions had hitherto been produced, he was not without hopes that they might yet be adjusted by the mediation of Great Britain, in conjunction with the other allied Powers of Europe. The adage, that the bitterest foes are those of our own household, was, however, but too deserving of universal acceptation. But amid these wars and rumours of wars, which daily reached our ears, it was some satisfaction to reflect that we, at least, maintained a good understanding with the world at large, notwithstanding the discord which raged on every side around us. Through the storm which agitated society throughout Europe, and endangered the existing institutions of all the States over which it rolled, our ship still rode triumphant; but if ever it should threaten the establishments of England, he had no doubt that our safety would be found in the renewed vigour and aroused energies of the people. He would not then go through the unnecessary details of the system of economy proposed, but might congratulate the House on that which had been already achieved, namely,—the repeal of taxes last Session, which pressed so grievously on the public, and on the lower classes more particularly. Nor could he forbear to advert in terms of praise to the moderation of his Majesty, who, notwithstanding the increased expenditure, had so far waived his personal claims as to recommend a revision of the Civil List. He hoped that Government would not fail to follow the example, for the awakening spirit of the age called loudly for reform and improvement. The character of the Sovereign, and the aspect of public affairs, warranted the presumption, that the spirit of the constitution would be kept up, and that Ministers in the work of reform would not be found wanting. Although the new Parliament had certainly been deprived of the services of several able statesmen,—of one who had long presided at the head of their councils, amongst others, of whose many excellent qualifications that was no time to speak,—he trusted they would be enabled to do their duty to their own credit and to the satisfaction of their country. He had now done all that he had proposed, and would leave the further discussion of such important subjects to the deliberate judgment of abler debaters and more experienced statesmen, merely adding, that he would give his decided support to the present Government, as one calculated to uphold the liberty of the people, the safety of the Church, and the dignity of the Crown. The noble Lord concluded by reading the Address, which, as usual, embodied and echoed all the sentiments of the King's Speech.

Mr. *R. A. Dundas*, in rising to second the Address, also craved the indulgence of the House, and observed, that at a period of such unusual excitement at home, and more than ordinary embarrassment in our foreign relations, he trusted he should be pardoned for feeling some embarrassment, and that he could not be expected, in the presence of so many Gentlemen, better capable than he was of doing justice to these important subjects, to enter much at large into the consideration of the topics which they suggested. Although it was not for him to offer an opinion on the cause of the Revolution in France, or to say whether it proceeded from the Sovereign or the people, or whether it was produced by the acts of the King or his Advisers, yet he was convinced there was not a Member of that House, whatever might be his political creed, who did not regret that event: he repeated, he should feel surprised if there was any Member who did not join with the majority in regretting the events which arose from that Revolution, and the circumstances which attended it—circumstances which were calculated to awaken those feelings respecting civil dissensions which it was fondly hoped, had been allayed for ever, and which were calculated to produce others so dangerous to the tranquillity of Europe. While he deplored these events, it was, however, a subject of congratulation that the illustrious person now called to the throne of France, and who was said to be distinguished by almost every grace which adorns humanity, had declared his determination to preserve most faithfully the relations of amity with this country. After alluding to the fact that the other Powers of Europe had recognised the new government of France as promptly as this country, the hon. Member observed, that the same reasons which produced regret for the changes which had taken place in France, must operate to produce still greater regret for the disturbances in the Netherlands. It might, indeed, have been supposed that the people of a country which had suffered so much from the horrors of a war, and which had been so often made the arena on which the great Powers of Europe decided their quarrels, would have been taught by the sad experience of former calamities, to restrain their feelings within the bounds of moderation, and to have adopted every reasonable method of redressing their grievances, before they had recourse to the power of arms. As, however, they had unfortunately pursued a different course, it was some consolation, in the midst of the anxieties felt for the peace of Europe, when a country so intimately connected with the causes of all former contests was in a state of anarchy, that, however appalling the prospect of war might be, or however much the present unsettled state of Belgium might affect the interests of all other countries, it was, he repeated, gratifying to find that no jealousies prevailed on the subject between the great Powers of Europe—that they were determined to take no mean advantage of the calamities with which the Netherlands might be afflicted, and that they were resolved to respect in their full force the treaties of 1815, and use their most strenuous exertions in obedience to them, to restore the tranquillity of Europe. Adverting to Portugal, he said he was glad to hear that the Ruler of that country had determined to give his subjects an Act of Amnesty, and he hoped that in doing so he would also learn for the future to respect the laws of humanity. If the Portuguese have chosen Don Miguel for their sovereign, it was not for this country or any country to dictate to them more than to the French the person they should select. He approved of the course pursued by the Government towards Portugal, although he did not think the recognition of Don Miguel's authority could inspire in the House or the country any feelings of respect for his character as a Sovereign. Greece had not been mentioned in his Majesty's Speech, but he felt bound to declare that he believed the delay of the settlement of that country had not proceeded from any want of care or attention on the part of his Majesty's Government; and he also believed that the new government of France would be found as anxious as Russia or as this country to co-operate in the fulfilment of those treaties which would secure to it perfect independence, and enable its inhabitants to indulge once more that spirit of enterprise for which they had been in former times so celebrated. Turning from our foreign to our domestic relations, it was a matter of congratulation to all lovers of their country to know, that however gloomy might be the prospects of the people in the apprehensions of some persons, the seeds of civil dissension had not yet been successfully sown in this country. For 140 years, since the period of the Revolution, the people had enjoyed, under our excellent constitution, full and uninterrupted prosperity. Abroad the arms of the country had prospered by the courage and devotion of the people—at home their liberties had been protected and secured by the working of their justly-praised Constitution, He would say, indeed, that England was the great birth-place of rational liberty. In it, of all countries on earth, was to be found in the greatest perfection that alliance of social order with good government, which formed the happiness of the people, and which was far removed from the visionary plans of those constitution-makers, who sought to pervert the judgment of the people, that they might the better instigate them to mischief. The laws and the religion of this country formed its security and its safeguard. While other nations groaned under the yoke of tyranny and oppression, and while the people of other countries either suffered without relief or subverted their Government and institutions, the Constitution of England had remained untouched and unaffected, like that sacred chain of nature which binds the jarring elements in peace. Disorders, it was true, there had been, and attempts, he knew, were not wanting to excite discontent and dissatisfaction; but they arose not from any defect in that Constitution, but from the depravity of human nature; they were the work of men who were wicked enough to contrive any kind of mischief, but who lacked the courage to execute it, and who would render others the sole victims of their own dark and dangerous policy. He was convinced, however, that there existed, among the intelligent and enlightened portion of the people of this country, a bond of union which was unknown to others; and having that bond of union, under the safeguard of the Constitution, there was no real ground of apprehension. He looked, however, in these critical times, with confidence to his Majesty's Government, and particularly to his right hon. friend near him, (Sir Robert Peel,) and the noble Duke at the head of the Treasury; and he was convinced that the Parliament would not hesitate to arm them with powers suited to the exigencies of the occasion. He could not conclude, without deploring the loss which that House had sustained in the melancholy death of one of its most eminent Statesmen—a death the more melancholy from its taking place within sight of that town, to the prosperity of which his efforts had always been especially directed, and at the moment when one of the great objects of his desire, as well as of its inhabitants, had been brought to a glorious and successful termination. Whatever difference of opinion might prevail, with regard to the commercial policy of that Gentleman, he was sure there was no Member of that House who did not feel regret for his death, and deplore the loss of a man whose talents were unquestioned, and whose life had been devoted to the service of his country. This eulogium might be styled foreign to the subject before the House; but although that right hon. Gentleman's political opponent, he thought he should be unworthy of a place in that House if he failed to pay a just and proper tribute to his talents and his services. With regard to the questions of the Civil List and the Regency, he was confident they would receive due consideration from the House; and he therefore should now conclude by expressing his belief, that the distress of the country, felt so strongly at the commencement of the Session, had, as was anticipated, subsided under the influence of time. He thanked the House for the indulgence with which they had been pleased to hear him; he would no longer trespass upon their time, but would conclude by expressing his cordial concurrence in the Address moved by his noble friend.

The Speaker having read the Address,

Lord *Althorp* said, that the subjects to which his Majesty's Speech, and the Address which had been moved by the noble Lord referred, might be classed under two heads—our domestic and our foreign relations; on both of which he begged to say a few words. With respect to the first, he had heard with gratification that part of the King's Speech which declared his Majesty's determination to enforce strict economy in every branch of the public expenditure. Such a declaration, if duly acted upon, would communicate general satisfaction throughout the country. With respect also to the passage in his Majesty's Speech which related to the Civil List, it was most gratifying to him, and it must be most gratifying to every one, to find that his Majesty was disposed to place his interests in the hereditary revenues, and in the other funds, which, in former settlements of the Civil List, had been reserved to the Crown, at the disposal of Parliament. He was quite sure that in doing so his Majesty might rely with perfect confidence on the House and the country; because he was certain, that while the House and the country must feel the absolute necessity of the most rigorous economy and retrenchment, they would be very sorry indeed to make such an arrangement with respect to the Civil List, as would be incompatible with the comfort and dignity of the Sovereign. He hoped, however, that whenever this subject was brought under the consideration of Parliament, the particular interests of his Majesty would be carefully separated from all other interests; for nothing could be more inconvenient, or more calculated to foster unjust prejudices, than that questions relating to the maintenance of the proper dignity of the Crown should be united to questions with which they ought to be altogether unconnected. He hoped, therefore, that the estimates of the Civil List, when submitted to the House, would be in such a shape as would admit of their being discussed with reference solely to what was due to the honour and dignity of the Crown; and that the other questions to which he adverted should be considered with reference to the general expenditure of the country. As to the Regency question, he was happy to understand that it was to be brought forward. Until, however, the provisions which it was intended to propose were known, it would, of course, be impossible to make any particular observation on that subject. With reference to the last topic of a domestic nature to which his Majesty's Speech adverted, it must be quite unnecessary for him to say, that he lamented as much as any man could lament, the turbulence and malicious mischief which had been manifested in various parts of the country, and especially in the neighbourhood of the metropolis. It was certainly most deeply to be regretted that any portion of the people, however suffering from distress, should be so misguided as to be induced to destroy the property of their employers, and thereby to diminish the power of those employers to assist them. He would not say any more on the domestic topics of his Majesty's Speech. As to our foreign relations, and first with respect to the recent occurrences in France, he begged to observe, that the honorable Seconder had expressed a regret at those occurrences which was not to be found in the King's Speech. All that the Speech did, was to announce the fact, "that the elder branch of the House of Bourbon no longer reigned in France, and that the Duke of Orleans had been called to the Throne by the title of King of the French." If the hon. Gentleman meant by his regret, that he regretted that any government had been induced to invade the liberties of a country, in such a regret he perfectly concurred. But if the hon. Gentleman meant that he regretted that a sovereign and a ministry, so misconducting themselves, should suffer for their behaviour, in a regret of that nature he could not for a moment concur. As to the Netherlands, he was sorry that his Majesty had been advised to express any opinion on the state of public affairs in that country. He entertained considerable objection to the part of the Address which expressed to his Majesty a corresponding opinion on that subject; but it was so inconvenient, and was attended with so much disadvantage to discuss a question of that nature on an occasion like the present, that he would abstain from saying or doing anything more than entering his protest against any interference on the part of our Government in the domestic concerns of the Netherlands. As to the external and diplomatic considerations which might arise out of existing circumstances, that was a question which stood on very different grounds. With respect to the proposed recognition of the Sovereign of Portugal, when he considered that the present sovereign of that country had been a sovereign *de facto* for three years, his hostility against any foreign interference with a *de facto* government compelled him to say, that he did not think we should do well if we delayed the proposed measure. Having stated his views on these several points, he would proceed to make a few observations on the general state of the country. He confessed that he was not alarmed on that point. He did not believe that the country was in such a state of general discontent as to justify immediate apprehension. At the same time he felt that great skill and great care would be necessary to guide it safely through its difficulties; and he was bound to say, that he did not think his Majesty's present Ministers were qualified for so arduous an undertaking. But while he stated this he would add, that he should look at their measures, and if those measures appeared to him to be such as to deserve approbation, they should receive his most cordial support. He made that declaration for himself, but he believed it would also be found to express the sentiments and intentions of all his hon. friends near him [*assenting cheers from the Opposition*]. At the same time, feeling as he at present did with respect to the existing Administration, he should certainly not object to any proposition, the tendency of which might be to displace them. On the question of economy and retrenchment, he thought the country had a right to demand the strictest limitation in every department of the public expenditure. He thought that the country had a right to demand this; and he also thought that his Majesty's Government ought, in the present Session, to take a more extensive and statesman-like view of the general system of our taxation than it had hitherto done. It would be affectation, however, on his part, if he were to say that he had any expectation that it would undertake such a task. It might be, however, that they contemplated some proceeding of the nature he alluded to; and if so, he confessed it would come upon him as a very agreeable surprise. The object ought to be to take such an enlarged view of the principle of our taxation as might tend to render its pressure as light as possible on the industry of the country. There was another great question which he had long supported, the importance of which had not hitherto appeared to have been duly estimated by the country, but which now seemed likely to assume a more practical character. The people at large seemed at length to be convinced that the most effective measure towards a remedy for the various evils under which they laboured, was a reform in Parliament. For himself he believed, that if concessions on this subject had formely been made, less would have satisfied the people than would now satisfy them. This was not to him, however, a matter of the slightest regret. The reform ought to be extensive; and he was very far from being sorry that at the late elections the people seemed to be almost universally of the same opinion. He hoped and trusted, that in the course of the present Session much would be effected in furtherance of this most desirable object; and every measure of that description should receive his most cordial support.

Mr. *Dundas* was understood to say, that the noble Lord had misconceived his observations on Don Miguel.

The Marquis of *Blandford* said, it was of the greatest importance, in these eventful times, teeming with jealousy and suspicion on the part of subjects towards their rulers, that from this new Parliament, which ought to speak the voice of the people, his Majesty should hear and know what they felt and thought of the measures and character of the last Parliament: because, if his Majesty should be led to believe, that the last Parliament was generally approved of by his people, it would be one of the most fatal errors that could be palmed upon his Majesty, and might lead him to connect himself with that small faction in the State, which was notoriously the master of the last Parliament. That circumstance alone might defeat and disappoint all the hopes of those who placed their reliance upon the personal disposition of his Majesty, who were sincerely attached to our ancient Constitution of King, Lords, and Commons—and who looked to his present Majesty, as he undoubtedly had the power, with hopes that he would be the great instrument of restoring that Constitution to its pristine purity, and thereby prevent—what, at such a period as the present, was but too likely to happen—the bringing into disrepute among the people even the very frame of that Constitution; engendering perhaps a spirit for theories, novelties, and questionable "improvements," in place of a lawful endeavour to get back the well-known and long-tried Constitution of their ancestors. Under the last Parliament, laws were put in force which greatly increased the value of the current money then circulating in the kingdom, and a deaf ear was turned to all the just and reasonable petitions of the people for a corresponding reduction of the taxes. Hence the affairs of all persons concerned in land and trade became unexpectedly involved in confusion; and losses to so great an extent occurred, as in thousands and thousands of instances were productive of utter ruin—while the land itself, and most other sources of productive industry, suffered a diminution of their former value of the most alarming nature. Such, indeed, had been the influence of our fluctuating monetary system over other countries, that to it might be ascribed the contraction of the currency in France and elsewhere. That, again, had caused so great a want of employment among the working classes, wherever heavy taxes had to be paid, as seriously endangered the very existence of the governments where those in power had not the wisdom and the virtue to make large and corresponding reductions of the taxes, instead of endeavouring to prop their existence by forced loans, false credit, and all the abominations of the funding system. Under the last Parliament, the laws of England were fearfully altered; the Judges of the land, the ambassadors to foreign courts, the governors of our colonies, and a great variety of other officers, as well as placemen and pensioners, were paid far beyond what the country could afford; and at the same time doctrines and opinions were maintained, and conduct adopted by different functionaries, diametrically opposed to the maxims of our common law, and to those long-acted-upon principles of our ancestors, to which England owed her former prosperity and power. All this had, he contended, arisen from want of the proper intelligence, honesty, and superintendence of a fairly chosen and uncorrupted House of Commons, and the consequent dread of the due exercise of the power of impeachment by such a House. Trial by Jury—that palladium of our Constitution, had been, in some cases, absolutely set aside, in defiance of Magna Charta, and the declarations of the most learned text-writers and commentators upon our laws. In other cases, this celebrated mode of trial had been so accommodated and dealt with, as to have ceased altogether to be that palladium of the rights and liberties of the people that it used, and always was intended to be. The King's Attorney General, an officer utterly unknown even by name to the common law (and it would be difficult, he believed, for any lawyer to point out the Statute by which such a functionary was created), had assumed the most wanton and unconstitutional powers, and dared to threaten the liberty of the Press in language that ought to have deprived him of his office, even had it been a more legitimate one, and better known to the law and the Constitution than he supposed. Being wholly unconnected with those in place and power, or with any persons seeking place and power, he had determined to place upon record, for the information of his Majesty, what in his opinion—and, he believed, in the opinion of every intelligent and independent man in the kingdom—was the cause of all these evils; namely, the want of reform in the House of Commons. He meant, therefore, to move an Amendment to the Address. Very many of his brave and sensible fellow-subjects had already spoken their minds to his Majesty in the honest language of loyalty, and as in common with them, he had something to lose by misrule and convulsion, he could not suffer the present opportunity to pass by, without declaring fully and fairly those sentiments which were uppermost in his mind, and which he knew to be the prevailing sentiments in the minds of the great mass of his countrymen. The noble Marquis concluded by moving the following Amendment:—

"In this its first Address to the Throne of a new King, instead of making itself the mere echo of the Ministers of the Crown, this House feels that it ought to show itself to be the very mirror of the people; and that, to do so, it must not fail to lay before your Majesty all their thoughts and feelings, all their wants and wishes, as well as all their loyalty to your office, and attachment to your person.

"The discharge of this important duty, and the present serious aspect of public affairs, render it impossible, as well as improper, to address your Majesty otherwise than at considerable length.

"Your Majesty is to be informed that this House, in common with the great majority of your people, holds the memory of the House of Commons of the last Parliament in utter hatred and contempt, for the following reasons:—

"First, because the last House of Commons uniformly turned a deaf ear to the just complaints and petitions of your people; and, secondly, because instead of acting upon the old constitutional principle of withholding the supplies until the grievances of the people were redressed, which it was earnestly and seriously urged to do, it seemed to consider itself of no other use, and chosen for no other purpose, but to vote, night after night, immense sums of money, to be drawn from the pockets of the people; exhibiting, at the same time, the utmost indifference, and often the most sovereign contempt, of all consideration in what manner such enormous sums could be obtained, without the risk of involving the great productive interests of the country in the most extensive embarrassment and ruin.

"That in proof of this, your Majesty has only to look at the unprecedented numbers of bankruptcies and insolvencies of farmers, traders, and others of your honest and industrious subjects, through all the years of the existence of the last House of Commons; and your Majesty will thereby be convinced, that while great numbers of landed proprietors have been driven from their paternal mansions, and have been compelled to see them occupied by loan-mongers and stock-jobbers, while others have removed themselves, their families, and their fortunes, for ever from your shores; and while the middle classes of your subjects have been reduced with frightful rapidity to the labouring class, the labouring class has been reduced to absolute beggary and want. That numbers have actually died from starvation, and others have been obliged to submit to the most degrading services, and to see themselves and their families the victims of fever, induced by famine—that thus, in a short time, instead of ruling, like the two first Princes of the House of Brunswick, over a nation devoted to your government by the happiness and blessings it should enjoy, your Majesty may find yourself ruling over a nation of paupers and of placemen—of those who live upon the taxes and the poor-rates on the one hand, and on the other hand of loan-mongers and borough-mongers, wallowing in the stagnant and unproductive accumulations of their joint and several monopolies. Such, Sire, are the effects of the accursed and unnatural funding system, in its last agonies, and the vain attempts to save this monster in England are at this moment overturning the governments of other countries far more rapidly than the folly, or even the wickedness of their rulers. That the acts of the late House of Commons, both of omission and commission, under which the people of this once happy country have been brought to such a state of wretchedness and suffering, inculpate all concerned in the highest degree of criminality; from which nothing can excuse them but a sincere and contrite confession of their sins, and a total and immediate alteration of their conduct, without which it will be the duty of this House to expose, by name, to your Majesty, all those who are feeding upon the vitals of the country, as the only chance left, since argument has failed, of saving itself, and perhaps even the Throne of your Majesty, from the storms of convulsion.

"That in order to have obviated such complicated evils as are hereinbefore set forth, it was the duty of the late House of Commons to have done more, and to have talked much less.

"That that House was told, both within these walls and without these walls, that the reason why it felt no sympathy in their sufferings, no anxiety for their relief, was because the majority of its Members had an interest directly opposite to the interests of the people; that this majority was not chosen, as of right it ought to have been, by the majority of the land-owners and householders of England; but was nominated and appointed by a few individuals, who, partly by the effects of time and accident, but still more by a barefaced perversion of the spirit and meaning of our laws and Constitution, had acquired the power of selling, or otherwise disposing of, the seats in this House, in such manner as best suited their own interests.

"That the late House of Commons was also repeatedly called upon, entreated and implored, to set about reforming such a monstrous abuse, but that it uniformly refused to listen to such call; and, though hesitating, fluctuating, and changing, upon other questions of vital consequence to the country, upon this question of reform it determined to follow the advice of one of its own Members, and one of its own 'temporary elective dictators, dependent upon its own corrupt and prostituted votes,' which has been truly called 'the most odious of all forms of tyranny,' to 'oppose reform in every shape to the end of its political existence;'—and that, to the eternal disgrace of the last House of Commons, it kept this profligate determination obstinately to the last. But your Majesty may be assured, that if your Majesty had not been advised to dissolve the last Parliament in the sudden and unexpected manner in which it was dissolved, the late glorious events which have taken place in France, would have had a mighty effect in shaking this profligate determination of the said House, and of inducing it to consider the difference between the guilt of bringing on death upon a nation by slow poison, or by a sudden blow; and that, by the law of England, there is such a thing as treason against the people as well as treason against the King. Your Majesty may also be further assured, that when great numbers of the nobility, being members of the Privy Council, were charged, in despite of the constant prayers of the Church, with being traffickers of the seats in this House, and that one of the fruits of such traffic, was, not an endowment of 'grace, wisdom, and understanding,' but an endowment of more than half a million a year of the public money among themselves; and that another fruit was the patronage of the Church, of the Army and Navy, and of the collection of about sixty millions a year of taxes among the families, friends, and dependents of the masters of seats in the House of Commons. If these things had been seriously considered, it is not to be believed that the blood of Englishmen would submit to be for ever tainted with such political disgrace, but that there would have been a race among the said masters, and the buyers and sellers of seats in Parliament, who should be foremost in laying down upon the altar of this country this unhallowed and most damned property, or power of trafficking in the representation of the Commons of England. Your Majesty may consider it as the firm conviction of the people—that if the last House of Commons had done its duty, it ought, upon every principle of justice, to have reduced the taxes at least in the same proportion that it raised the value of the currency, and thus half the present amount of taxes might and ought to have been taken off, including the whole of the cruel and harassing Excise laws, and all those cheating indirect taxes, by which every labouring man who earns and expends 30*l.* a year, has 18*l.* taken from him. All the just expenses of the Government, and the interest of the Debt, might have been reduced, with perfect equity, in the same proportion as the taxes, and all the unjust expenses of Government, in useless and sinecure places, the diplomatic, colonial, and all other departments, kept up solely for the purposes of corruption, might and would have been done away with, if the last House of Commons had been the real, and not the sham, Representatives of the people. That the late attempt to destroy the freedom of the Press, and freedom of election in France, and thereby the more effectually to rob the people of that country of their rights and property, never would have been made, if the last House of Commons had had the sense and honesty to have restored freedom of election in England; that the king of France might still have been upon his throne, and all danger have been prevented from the mischiefs of anarchy and confusion, which have only been avoided by the unexampled wisdom of the brave and learned youth of France, and the splendid forbearance of the brave and honest working men of Paris, who did not hesitate to risk their lives when they saw that a system of tyranny and taxes was about to be fixed for ever on them, and on their children. And in reference to this affair, so important in its consequences, too much praise and thanks cannot be given to your Majesty for the honour you have conferred on England, whose sons were heretofore famed as 'ever first and foremost in the achievement of liberty,' in taking the lead, and setting the example of acknowledging the new king of the French; who, like your Majesty, sits upon his Throne by the best and highest of all titles, that which is said to be the voice of God himself; namely, the voice of the people. For this great honour and service, it is the unanimous opinion of this House, of the whole nation, not to say of all Europe, that this act may justly be ascribed to the personal character of your Majesty, and to your own sense of justice, and of the true interests of your subjects; and your Majesty, therefore, deserves to enjoy the hope, that your name may be remembered by millions still unborn, for the lasting blessings of peace and friendship between France and England, which this act of your Majesty has every prospect of consolidating. And the Members of this, the first House of Commons in the new Parliament, promise your Majesty, as it is fit they should, that if others learn nothing by example they will; as they do not doubt that a King who has already given such proofs of his desire of being beloved by his people, and of promoting the welfare and happiness of the industrious classes, that a King, who more than thirty years ago, from his own mouth in Parliament, denounced 'monopolies, as the canker of the State,' and called upon the Legislature 'to root them out,' will never endure to see his people ruined, and his Crown put in hazard by that worst of all monopolies—the monopoly of the seats of the House of Commons. So they implore your Majesty to withdraw your confidence and the patronage of the Crown, from all persons engaged in, or resolved upon, upholding this odious traffic, and thereby implicating your Majesty in such connexion. And if, in so doing, your Majesty, who as yet stands clear of this system, and above all suspicion in the eyes of the country, should have to encounter a factious opposition to your government, or if the usurping proprietors of seats in the House of Commons should be so lost to every sense of justice, and to their own interest, as to dare to set up their usurpation against the ancient, just, and undoubted prerogatives of the Crown, your Majesty may rely upon the zealous and determined support of this House, and of your people, even to the last drop of their blood.

"And your Majesty may be assured, that nothing short of the complete annihilation of this odious and unrighteous monopoly of seats in the House of Commons will ever satisfy the just and unanswerable demands of your people to be restored to their ancient Laws and Constitution, of which they know they have been most wrongfully deprived by the corruption and prostitution of this House, within little more than the last hundred years, which is but as yesterday in the history of laws of such high antiquity, and such transcendent fame throughout the known world. That, next to the disesteem in which the memory of the last House of Commons is held by the people, for refusing to enter upon the great question of Parliamentary Reform, would be the grievous disappointment and just indignation of the people if nothing more than the representation of a few large towns were to be offered them, while the great master-grievance, of a proprietary interest and domination over seats in this House should be allowed to continue. And your Majesty may also rest assured, that the great majority of your people have no desire to alter the frame of the Government of King, Lords, and Commons, which has endured so long, and been productive of such advantages to the community; neither do they think it necessary or expedient to claim or demand any new plan or scheme of representation unknown and untried in the history and practice of their ancestors; but they will never cease to demand that, wherever, according to that history and that practice, the right of representation has been bounded, there shall also be bounded the burthen of taxation."

Mr. O'Connell seconded the Amendment.

Mr. Cresset Pelham addressed the House, but was inaudible. He was understood to approve of the Address.

Mr. *Long Wellesley* was understood to say, that he should be unworthy of the confidence which some part of his countrymen had shown themselves inclined to repose in him, if he did not repeat in that place what he had declared elsewhere;

namely, — that he was friendly to the cause of reform, and that he was convinced that nothing could relieve the distress of the country, except a change of system, a remission of taxes, and an alteration in the mode of collecting them. He should have been glad had he seen in the King's Speech any declaration which could have led him to expect a remission of taxes. He said this, because he believed that the best interests of the nation were in a state of great depression—because he believed that there was disaffection in the country. Yes, he believed there was disaffection; although, looking at the general state of opinion, he also believed that there never was a better, or sounder, or more loyal sense of public feeling in the nation, than there was at the present moment. He likewise believed that there never was a time when all the measures of reform, retrenchment, and economy, which the condition of our circumstances required, could be affected with so much security. It would have been satisfactory, most satisfactory to him, to have heard an annunciation made by the Government of its intention to adopt such a measure, because he was convinced that it would have placed both Government and Parliament in better odour with the people than it was now likely they would ever be. He had lived and travelled much upon the continent, and from what he had seen and heard there, he was satisfied that our foreign policy could not long remain in the state in which it was at present. He called the revolution in France a glorious revolution, on account of the exemplary mildness and moderation with which it had been conducted. But if there was one man, either in that House or elsewhere, so stultified as to suppose, that the revolution, and the public sentiment which it had engendered, would stop where it now was, either in France or Belgium, that man was most egregiously mistaken. He was satisfied that they would see similar occurrences to those which they had witnessed in France and Belgium, taking place in Italy, in the Prussian States, and indeed in all those countries which had been ceded by the Holy Alliance to different sovereigns, and which had been prevented by the power of the sword from giving expression to the feelings which animated them. That was his sincere conviction, and therefore the question to be now considered was, not what would originally have been best to do, — that was unfortunately past and gone,—but how we should act, to prevent that which was already bad from becoming worse. The course to be adopted to attain that object was, in his opinion, a system of complete non-intervention. He believed that in that opinion he was not singular. When he first heard the Address read over, he thought that, if his recollection did not fail him, he had seen some diplomatic paper, which justified him in the sentiment which he had just expressed respecting non-intervention. He had, since that time, looked over the Debates of the House of Lords, and, to his surprise, he found a diplomatic note, delivered by our minister to the Congress at Verona, bearing the signature of the Duke of Wellington, and declaring the decision of the Cabinet of that day to be in favour of a deviation from the general policy of the Holy Alliance, and in support of the system of non-intervention. There was, in the Speech from the Throne, a most extraordinary sentence, to which he should have occasion more specifically to allude by-and-by. If the meaning of that sentence were, that it was the intention of the Ministers not to interfere, either with the form, or the principle, of the government which the Belgians intended to establish for themselves, or with any object which they might propose to effect, by the assertion of their independence,—if the meaning of that sentence were, that they would only interfere with the consent of France, in such a manner as would put an end to anarchy, and prevent a government from being formed injurious to France,—for Belgium, it ought to be recollected, had been placed in a false position, for the express purpose of checking the aggressions of France,—if the meaning of that sentence, he repeated, were, that Ministers intended to assent to the establishment of a free government in Belgium, the case would be much altered from what he understood it to be; but certainly, as it was at present, it both deserved and demanded explanation. The sentence was as follows:—" I lament that the enlightened administration of the King (meaning the king of the Netherlands) should not have preserved his dominions from revolt, and that the wise and prudent measure of submitting the desires and complaints of his people to the deliberations of an extraordinary meeting of the States General should have led to no satisfactory result." He would not call the attention of the House—for it would be unnecessary—to all the extraordinary circumstances which had both preceded and succeeded his Majesty's resolution to call the States General together. But the King's Speech proceeded,—" I am endeavouring, in concert with my Allies, to devise such means of restoring tranquillity as may be compatible with the welfare and good government of the Netherlands, and with the future security of other States." Now it was worth remarking, that there was nothing said here of the independence of Belgium, but something was said about the future security of other States, and he should like to know what was meant by that. If it was meant that the fortresses of Belgium should not be permitted to remain in the possession of the Belgians, but should be garrisoned by foreign troops, then he would say, that there was not one soldier, unless indeed, he were a Russian or a Prussian, who would not become, whilst stationed in those fortresses, infected by the public opinion, which now pervaded the most intellectual portions of Europe. He had no hesitation in asserting, that if it were the intention of Government to recur to the policy of the Holy Alliance, which had annexed Belgium to Holland, without any regard to the wants, and wishes, and feelings of the Belgians, that object could not be effected in the present state of the world. He would likewise add, that if it were the determination of the Government to persist in that intention, the country was at that hour on the eve of a war, and where it would end God Almighty alone knew. The hon. Member then proceeded to comment upon the following clause in the King's Speech:—" Appearances of tumult and disorder have produced uneasiness in different parts of Europe: but the assurances of a friendly disposition which I continue to receive from all foreign Powers, justify the expectation that I shall be enabled to preserve for my people the blessings of peace." He likewise adverted to that paragraph in the King's Speech, in which allusion is made to the recognition of Don Miguel as King of Portugal. He said, that he could not understand the principle which had induced the Government to pursue such an opposite line of policy, as acknowledging Don Miguel, as king of Portugal, and ackowledging the Duke of Orleans as king of France. He concluded, by apologizing for the length of time, during which he had intruded on the attention of the House, and by thanking it for the indulgence with which it had listened to his observations.

Sir *J. Yorke* said, that he was one of those Members who was most happy to see the hon. Member, who had just sat down, returned again to the House; and he was particularly pleased that he had come back to it with such a magazine of oratory, and still more so, that all that oratory was to be expended on a subject with which the hon. Member was not popularly considered to be very conversant,—he meant the subject of finance. All the drift of the hon. Member's speech—for he saw the feeling of liberality which the hon. Member had towards the French revolution—all the drift of the hon. Member's speech was, that he could not allow the Mover and Seconder of the Address to deplore the French revolution as an event calculated to disturb the peace of Europe. For his own part he did most sincerely deplore its occurrence: for though the noble Mover, and the hon. Seconder—one or other of them, he did not exactly remember which—had declared that he would not say who was wrong or who was right, he must say that a fact had occurred which might produce throughout Europe a convulsion, which the hon. Member, with all his ability, might find it difficult to allay. The hon. Member had told the House that he had been bred up a diplomatist—that he had lived and travelled much in foreign countries—and that he had received great information on particular points now in dispute; and he had then comforted it by saying, that there was not a single member of the European family of Kings who would not shortly undergo the same fate as the late King of France.

Mr. *L. Wellesley*.—" No, no, no, no."

Sir *J. Yorke* begged the hon. Gentleman's pardon. He did not wish to misstate the hon. Member's sentiments, perhaps he had misunderstood him. All he wished to do was to follow the hon. Member through the numerous points of his multifarious harangue. He could not agree to the Amendment which had been proposed to the Address. He thought the Speech from the Throne a good Speech—good in itself—not merely good on account of its omissions, though he was inclined to admit the truth of the old maxim, "The least said, the soonest mended." His Majesty had been bred up in a man-of-war—had been educated in the cock-pit, and had come from sitting on a midshipman's chest to take his seat upon the imperial Throne of these realms. It was comfortable to him, as a member of the same profession to which his Majesty had formerly belonged, to see such an array of the Representatives of the people assembled on the first day of the Session, to do justice to the expectations of the country, and to endeavour to dole out, from their concocted wisdom, a system which might give repose to Europe, and secure the peace and tranquillity of the world. The noble Lord had proposed a long Amendment, which, in the language of his profession, he would call a tough and long yarn, and which looked vastly like the pamphlet of some political *doctrinaire*. "I felt for you Sir," said Sir Joseph, addressing the Speaker, "as you proceeded in the laborious task of reading that document. One pair of lungs was scarcely equal to the feat. I felt for you, Sir, extremely, as you had not only to read the original Address, which was long enough in all conscience, but also the still longer Amendment which was attached to it. I was surprised that the Representative of the house of Marlborough, with all his manliness and courage, should have had the boldness to present such an Amendment to your notice. He ought to recollect, that if all these taxes were done away with, neither the house of Wellington, nor the house of Marlborough, could retain that great share of gratitude which they now enjoy by the gifts of a rich and powerful people." He should not quarrel with the original Address merely because it expressed an anxiety to allay the turbulent spirit now abroad. He did not understand, nor would any man who had sat so long in the House as he had, and had voted 1200,000,000*l.* for defraying the expenses of the last war, understand why we were not to interfere and prevent the fortresses of the Netherlands from falling into the possession of France. Those fortresses were security fortresses, and the last remains of the indemnity money which this country had received from France. Was not his Majesty to be at liberty to revert to the treaties by which those fortresses had been repaired? Was he to remain as quiet as if he were struck dumb? Was he to sit with his orb in one hand, and with his sceptre in the other, and become a mere nonentity in Europe, at a time when he was naturally anxious to prevent the Netherlands from falling again into the hands of France, and to deprive France of the power of commanding the entrance into that glorious river the Scheldt, and of making herself once more the mistress of the basins of Antwerp? Let them recollect that that great master of the art of war, Napoleon, had said, "that he who held Antwerp held the key to Holland," because he could overwhelm it by the legions which he could in a proper season, pour over the ice He held, that his Majesty had acted rightly in making the allusion which he had made to the present condition of the Netherlands. He thought that his Majesty could scarcely have said less than he had said, and that his Ministers, with all the responsibility to which they were exposed, had acted wisely and prudently in putting the present Speech into his Majesty's mouth. He desired to see unanimity in the House on the present occasion. He admitted that they ought to be cautious, and to look at the signs of the times; but even that caution ought to teach them to do that by their King, their country, and their families, which would enable them to transmit unimpaired to their posterity the various blessings which they now enjoyed.

Mr. *Hume* said, that it was with great reluctance he rose to address the House on the present occasion, because he had expected that his learned friend below him, who was so much better qualified for the task, would have been among the first to notice the various topics introduced into his Majesty's Speech. He had heard with regret the speech which had just been delivered by the gallant officer opposite; it breathed war, and nothing but war throughout, in support of a system which had been condemned by all good men, from its first establishment, as founded for the express purpose of putting down liberty and supporting despotism all over Europe. He therefore regretted that the gallant officer, in giving his support to the Government, had thought it necessary to give his support to that infamous system. The Speech from the Throne would be read with great regret by the country, for it breathed nothing but war and expensive establishments, and mentioned not a syllable respecting the distress which pervaded all parts of the empire. He was pleased at hearing the expression of approbation which the hon. Member, who spoke last but one, had given to the change which had recently taken place in the government of France, in contradiction to the Speech from the Throne, which viewed that change with regret. What country had we got into? Was England the land of liberty, now that we heard a noble Mover of a Parliamentary Address to the Throne uttering language of regret on seeing a great people rising in their strength, and wresting their liberties from the unwilling hands of their despots? He protested, in the name of the people of England, against the practice of bringing the Speech forward in Parliament without any previous notice of its contents, and of then following it up by an Address, the mere echo of the Speech preceded by speeches of the Mover and Seconder. It was impossible for hon. Members under such circumstances, to know what they were doing, and to distinguish the King's Speech from the speeches which followed it. He should therefore consider as one speech the King's Speech, the speeches of the Mover and Seconder, and the speech of the gallant officer who had just sat down; and therefore it was, that he regretted from his heart that utterance had been given by them to a sentiment of disapprobation on the firm conduct of the people of France during the late trying emergency. They had been oppressed, he might say, cruelly oppressed, by an individual who held the throne by the selection of the potentates of Europe, and not as the throne of his ancestors—for that had been forfeited, and had been held by another for many years. It mattered not how long it had been held, because held it had been; and the hopes of the re-establishment of the Bourbons in France were once as faint as the hopes which he entertained of becoming king of France. Foreign bayonets, however, did their work, and displaced Napoleon; for the people of the continent came forward with heart and soul in the cause, on the promise and pledge that they should be rewarded with free constitutions as a compensation for the blood they were called on to shed, and the trouble to which they were forced to submit. The Bourbons had been replaced on the Throne of France by the force of British bayonets. The fact might be unpleasant to some ears; but so it was, though their return was coupled with a constitution and chartered rights. That constitution the king of France had attempted to take from them, almost from the first day on which he had sworn to defend it. He was only the chief executive officer of the government, and as such he was bound to be the guardian of the chartered rights of the people. Yet, notwithstanding this, he went on year after year, encroaching upon them; and now they, the representatives of a free people, were compelled to hear a British King and British Parliament, and a British officer too, regretting that tyranny had been overwhelmed, and that France had once more been restored to liberty. So far was he from joining in that regret, that he could scarcely listen to the expression of it with patience, knowing, as he did, that the despots of Europe were all banded together to stifle liberty, even in the cradle. He must own, that it was with regret that he saw a red coat rising to second the Address. The character of an officer was naturally formed by the system of discipline to which he was subject, and therefore it was, that he felt hurt that any British officer—and the hon. Gentleman opposite was a British officer—should regret the changes recently effected in France. To the honour of France and Frenchmen be it told, that no such change where despotism got the better, had ever been conducted with such moderation. Let the gallant officer look at all the States of Europe, where despotism had prevailed over freedom; and let him recollect how the scaffolds had streamed with blood, and how many thousands and tens of thousands of enlightened patriots had been driven from their homes to gratify the spite, malice, and revenge of one or two crowned individuals. He regretted extremely, that the King had made the Speech which the House had that day heard. He believed, that his Royal heart was constant to the free institutions of his country, and that it was his bad advisers who had put into his mouth words which would be read with indignation by every honest man in the kingdom. The gallant officer said, that all the people of England regretted the success of the French revolution. He denied the truth of that position; he verily believed that four-fifths of the people of England and Scotland heartily rejoiced in it. He protested against a British King being made to utter sentiments which were directly at variance with those that had been expressed by the country at large. He believed, that there were individuals in this country who were sorry for what had taken place in France, because they saw that their unhallowed practices, their undue privileges, and the monopolies by which they were supported, were in danger. Such men might, and did, condemn the proceedings of the French, but honest Englishmen did not. The right hon. Secretary (Sir R. Peel), in the last Parliament, and in almost the last speech he made in that House, said, that the measures of the Government should be measures suited to the people,—measures which should meet with the concurrence of the people. The right hon. Gentleman said, that the Government would fall back upon the people, and look to the people alone for support. If, however, the right hon. Gentleman thought, that what he had put into the mouth of his Majesty was in accordance with the opinion of the people—if such was his belief, he would soon find himself mistaken. Throughout England the people had met on the subject of the changes that had taken place on the continent, and every where had they expressed in the highest terms their admiration of the courageous conduct of the French. He asked the right hon. Gentleman, whether it was consistent with the line of policy the Government meant to pursue, to put into the mouth of his Majesty a determination to interfere with the affairs of Belgium? He would boldly assert, that all men who were friends of freedom—all who felt for the true interests of this country, would deeply regret such an interference. Every man who loved liberty admired the Belgians for turning out the Dutch, who had acted in such an infamous manner. He repeated, that the Dutch had acted in the most infamous and scandalous manner. They had heard of incendiaries in Kent—had there been none in Antwerp? a fine city laid in ruins, and that too, when the king of Holland had not the slightest hope of retaining possession of it. Could it be, that the Ministers of England thought such conduct deserved the language which they had put into the mouth of his Majesty?—Was it an enlightened government that took away every vestige of personal liberty from the subject? Was it consistent with an enlightened government, ruling over two countries, that out of ten officers of the government, nine should be Dutch? Had the right hon. Gentleman forgotten that the freedom of the Press had been abolished, and that the Trial by Jury had been taken away; and was it after these things that the Duke of Wellington and Sir R. Peel had thought fit to call the government of the king of the Netherlands enlightened, and to put into the mouth of his Majesty sentiments so abhorrent to the people for England?—Was it possible for them to inflict a greater indignity on the British people? Let not the right hon. Gentleman suppose, that the explosion in France brought about that in Belgium. The Belgians were ready before; and, indeed, every one must be convinced that it was impossible for the system recently adopted there to go on long. The hon. Member who had spoken before the hon. Baronet had not been fairly dealt with; he did not say, that all governments were about to be revolutionized; he said, that all those countries which had been parcelled out by the Holy Alliance, contrary to the feelings of their people, must undergo some change. Such a circumstance was by no means improbable; and what was it in the King's Speech of which the people of England had to complain? Why, that those treaties which it was said were to pacify Europe, and which had been found to have exactly the opposite effect, were, notwithstanding, still to be maintained. It was for that House, on behalf of the people of England, to tell the Ministers that it would not concur in supporting those treaties. Was it not time for the House to hesitate, to doubt that policy which might formerly have appeared wisdom, but which was now proved not to be so? Was it not time to pause when they saw France removed from the alliance that had supported those treaties, and when they must know, that if those treaties were at all events to be supported, they must be supported by the labour and at the expense of the people of England alone, and in hostility to France, continuing the privations of our people, at whose expense they had, indeed, been originally procured? The hon. officer had talked of finance. Did he not know that twelve hundred millions had been expended by this country to restore the Bourbons, and that, in three days, all that we had done at so much expense had been destroyed? Did not the House see, that the ill-treated but glorious Belgians had been parcelled, out like so many pigs to a purchaser, in a manner disgraceful to Europe, but especially disgraceful to England, that had suffered such a parcelling? Was the Government now to support such a proceeding, and would doing so pacify Europe? Under these circumstances, could a greater insult be offered to the House of Commons, and to the suffering and starving people of England, than that of being told, that his Majesty meant to interfere in support of those treaties which had already fallen to pieces? In that respect the Speech was most improper, and he hoped that the House would not concur with the intention there expressed, but would support the Amendment. He should be glad to know how non-interference with Donna Maria, and interference with Belgium could be reconciled? They could not be reconciled; and such conduct, instead of adding to the character of England, would heap disgrace upon it. He asserted, that England was not prepared to sacrifice men or money in interference with the affairs of other countries. It was against the declaration that the Duke of Wellington had put into the mouth of his Majesty that the House ought to oppose their opinion, expressed by a strong majority. It would be a disgrace to England to boast of her own liberty, and yet force slavery on other nations. Some things might have happened since the last Parliament which had changed the opinion then expressed by the Ministers. He feared there had; but he must say, that if ever there was a man disappointed in his expectations of what other men would do, he was that man. He came down, expecting that some sort of reform and retrenchment would be proposed—that something would be done to relieve the burthens of the people—but he found nothing of the kind; on the contrary, he found the Ministers putting into the mouth of the King sentiments which threatened the interference of this country with the people of other countries. Instead of what he had anticipated, the first ten paragraphs of the King's Speech were about foreign politics. What did the people of this country care about foreign politics? What, he would again ask, could people who were starving at home, care about the government of other countries? He would ask any Member (at least every Member who had constituents) if he had not heard, before he came to that House, that, as the first part of his duty, he must attend to the reduction of the public burthens? He did not put that question to those who were their own nominees, nor to those who, by the use of unjust means of influence, had obtained seats in that House, but of all the rest he asked, whether they had not pledged themselves to effect for the people a great relief in the amount of taxation [*cheers from several parts of the House.*] Yet not one word had been said in the Speech about reduction of taxation. [*Some observation was here made to the hon. Member, who continued*]. He was told his language was not precisely what was due to the King, that he forgot what was required by delicacy: but to abstain from noticing such matters was not true delicacy towards the King—those men used the King ill who did not speak the truth to him—such individuals as the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues, for instance—if it was they who kept the King in ignorance of the real situation of the country. What were the people told in the Speech about economy? Literally nothing. If the right hon. Gentleman thought that the British people were for ever to be hewers of wood and drawers of water, while a small class lived luxuriously on their labours, he would find himself mistaken. Britons would not be less than Britons. If the feelings of the people had not been loudly expressed, they were not, for that reason, the less deep. They would, however, be expressed loudly enough before long. Their wants were neither numerous nor unreasonable, and they would have them supplied. What they wanted was, relief from taxation, and with that a cure of the present vice of elections. They wanted to get the Peers out of the Commons and to confine the former to their own department. That was the cry from one end of the country to the other. They asked for bread, and they were given stones—they were told that the Government meant to meddle with the affairs of other countries, and he believed they did so to keep the people of England quiet; for such had always been the tricky policy of this Government. But was such a course to be pursued when thousands were dying of want? [" *No, no,*" *from the Treasury benches.*] He was not surprised that they who fattened on the riches of the land should deny his assertion; but he wished they would go and look into the state of the people in different parts of the country, and then they would not deny that which no man could with truth deny. The people required a reform of that House, because that House was the origin of all the evils from which the country suffered. The noble Lord who had moved the Address had expressed a wish with which he (Mr. Hume) most heartily concurred—namely, that the Government should give liberty to all, inflict injury on none. He agreed with that sentiment; but he asked, was that the case at the present moment, when millions were granted for the gratification of a few at the expense of the starving artisans of the country? Every act of that House tended to the same point. He concurred with the hon. Member who spoke last but one, that if his Majesty had declared his firm intention of reducing the taxes, he would indeed have proved himself the father of his people. Was it consistent with their duty as Representatives, or even as self-called Representatives of the people, to pass such a milk and water Address as that which had now been put before them—an Address which left out everything that was of importance to the country? Perhaps he was wrong in the severity with which he had spoken on one point, for some hon. Gentlemen might think that there was abundance on the table of every peasant throughout the country. The Seconder of the Address had re-echoed the sentiments of the King, as to handing down the Constitution of the country unimpaired—a Constitution which the hon. Gentleman had described as untainted with innovation. Did the hon. Member mean to say, that the Constitution of this country now, was what it was a century and a half ago? If so, he denied the statement. A change had been effected for the benefit of the aristocracy at the expense of the people, and what had thus been taken from the people ought now to be restored to them. That was the opinion of the people, and on their behalf he protested against the course which the Government was now pursuing. There was one other thing to which he wished to allude. The Speech stated that there were individuals who were endeavouring to disturb the public mind, and that dissatisfaction existed among the people. He denied it; there was, indeed, great dissatisfaction with the Ministry, but no disaffection to the King. It did not exist in Scotland; he had seen much of the people there lately, and more quiet or better people he had never seen. There was no disaffection in England; perhaps it was meant to apply to Ireland. What! was it because the hon. member for Waterford had got some whim in his head? Why might he not have a whim in his head as well as anybody else? Was that, he repeated, any reason why the government of Ireland should exercise all its powers? Was there a man breathing, beyond the precincts of the Castle, who thought such proceedings necessary? The name of Mr. O'Connell must have frightened them; and so, because Mr. O'Connell had written a letter, calling a meeting to discuss whether it would be proper to dissolve the Union, the government of Ireland had thought fit to prevent the meeting by proclamation. What, was the Government so weak as not to be able to bear the paper bullets of one man? In the House of Commons his reasons must ultimately be weighed; if he could convince him that the Union ought to be at an end, he would vote for the separation; but the hon. Member would certainly have great difficulty in accomplishing that task. He had no hesitation in saying, that if any one should bring forward a proposition to put an end to the Union, he would listen to it with patience; and if Ireland was still to be treated as at this moment, he would entertain it with favour. He regretted that passage in the Speech which related to the Union, for union it was not. Ireland was not united to this country, but treated as one of her colonies, and in her government were to be found all the vices of a colonial government. When he saw the tenor of the Speech and of the Proclamation, he must think that it was the object of the Government to render despotism familiar to every man. If it was meant that disaffection existed in Ireland, he meant to deny the statement; for, setting the Duke of Leinster's meeting in opposition to that of the hon. member for Waterford, what did the whole matter come to but a difference of opinion? Was disaffection confined to the hon. member for Waterford? Then let him be named: let an Act of Parliament be passed against him: it would not be the first which had been enacted against him; for when he was duly returned to Parliament, an Act was contrived for the purpose of excluding him. The Ministers, however, had no right to say that Ireland was disaffected, merely because one Irishman was. If Mr. O'Connell [*cries of "Order,*

order"]; well, if the hon. member for Waterford thought that the repeal of the Union would be a good measure, this House was the only fit place to discuss that subject in. But was all Ireland to be gagged on account of one man; or could not the House of Commons enjoy freedom of speech without denying it to the people of Ireland? The Lord-lieutenant of Ireland had exercised a despotic power which was not called for, and his proclamation was a gagging proclamation. But what was most remarkable, this act of despotism had been levelled against one party only. The repealers of the Union had been gagged, but the Duke of Leinster and his friends had been allowed to do as they pleased. He contended that the proclamations of the Lord-lieutenant were unnecessary acts of oppression, and that to charge Ireland with disaffection was injurious and insulting to the people of that country. With the exception of two sentences, he could not concur with the Speech, and he warned the Ministers, that if, after the warnings given elsewhere, they still persevered in the same course—on them, and on those who supported them, must be the responsibility for the evils that would follow. To-morrow, when the Report was brought up, he should place on record his opinion, so as not to let it appear that he had been guilty of deserting his duty in bringing to the attention of his Majesty the real state of the country. The hon. Member resumed his seat, after apologising for the length at which he had troubled the House, and for any warmth of expression that in the course of his speech might have escaped from him.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, it appeared to him that it was the wish of the Members to come to an early expression of their sentiments on the Address, and he was glad, therefore, that he was not called upon to detain them at any length, either in support of his Majesty's Speech, or in answer to the objections which had been made against it. With regard to the speech of the noble Lord,—the fair, the temperate, and the candid speech of the noble Lord, for so he could only in justice characterize it,—that speech showed that it was not at all necessary for him to detain the House at any length; for with one single exception only, the noble Lord fully concurred in the Speech from the Throne. The hon. Gentleman who last addressed the House, had, it was true, pronounced a loud and angry denunciation against his Majesty's Speech, but that hon. Member had been able to find fault with it by no other means than an intentional misrepresentation of every part of it upon which he had treated.

Mr. *Hume* rose to order, and said, that he was incapable of intentional misrepresentation.

Sir *R. Peel* assured the hon. Gentleman, that he had meant to say unintentional misrepresentation. He was sure the hon. Member would do him the justice to suppose, that if he had said "intentional" it was by mistake. The hon. Gentleman had said, that his Majesty, in his Speech, charged the people of England with disaffection; but, so far from this being the fact, his Majesty had expressed the satisfaction which resulted to him from the conviction that he could rely with safety on the loyalty and the attachment of his people. "I reflect (these were the words of his Majesty) with the highest satisfaction on the loyalty and affectionate attachment of the great body of my people." It was altogether contrary to the fact, therefore, to say that his Majesty had charged the people with disaffection. His Majesty had, however, said, that he could not view without grief and indignation the attempt of some to traffic with the distresses and the sufferings of the people, and to raise themselves into unenviable notoriety by aggravating calamities where they did exist, and by raising imaginary evils where none were in reality to be found. This was a conjuncture which required all the temper, all the moderation, and all the patience they could command in their deliberations; and he must therefore say, that he regretted the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hume) should—not with bad intentions, he was sure,—have indulged in inflammatory language, which, to say the least of it, could not conduce to that cool and temperate discussion which was always desirable, and never more necessary than at present. He put it to the hon. Gentleman whether it were right,—whether it were consistent with the fact,—to represent the people of this country as in a starving condition. If there were suffering in some parts of the country, no man, he was sure, could more deeply lament or more sincerely commiserate it, than himself; and, however firm might be the determination he had taken to put down disturbance and acts of violence by every legal means, he could assure the hon. Gentleman that the consideration of how the causes of the people's distress could be removed should never be absent from his mind. But the people were not in a starving condition, as the hon. Member must know, or might have known, if he had inquired. That there was severe suffering and distress in some parts of the country, could not be denied, but that was a condition of things which, notwithstanding the general state of the people, was, he feared, in many places almost unavoidable. In approaching that part of his Majesty's Speech which related to our foreign policy, the hon. Gentleman had, he must say, broached a doctrine that was altogether new in the House of Commons. The hon. Gentleman had said, that foreign policy was not interesting to the House of Commons, and that the people of England cared nothing about foreign policy. When the hon. Gentleman talked about economy, let him tell the hon. Gentleman, that foreign affairs must not, could not, be lost sight of; and that they would force themselves upon his consideration. If the hon. Gentleman would not be economical with reference to other than the internal affairs of the country,—if the hon. Gentleman's economical policy were based upon the exclusion of all reference to other countries,—the hon. Gentleman would be a very dangerous adviser of the Crown, and would find himself ultimately no true economist. With regard to what the hon. Gentleman had said upon that part of the Speech from the Throne which related to France, let him tell the hon. Gentleman, that though it was only a short time since he had been in possession of the Speech, yet that time was quite long enough to have enabled the hon. Member to ascertain what it contained. And here he must protest against the notion which the hon. Gentleman had inculcated, that the Government was responsible for every word which fell from the Mover and Seconder of the Address. He had heard nothing in the speeches of the two hon. Members who moved and seconded the Address which, rightly understood, he dissented from; but, let him tell the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hume) that he was not a little surprised to find him supposing it to be necessary that any Gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address should be previously tutored by a Minister of the Crown, and that, consequently, the Government was responsible for all that fell from Gentlemen on such occasions. This was hardly consistent with the doctrines usually propounded by the hon. Member. The hon. Gentleman had said, first, that his Majesty had regretted the events that had taken place in France; and, secondly, that the Government, being disappointed in the successful opposition that had been made to the ordinances, must, consequently, have approved of those ordinances having been issued. Now, with regard to the first assertion of the hon. Gentleman, that was in a moment destroyed by the mere observation, that it was contrary to the fact. His Majesty, so far from expressing any feeling upon the subject, had merely narrated the simple fact, that "the elder branch of the House of Bourbon no longer reigned in France, and that the Duke of Orleans had been called to the Throne by the title of the King of the French." The hon. Gentleman might, he thought, very easily understand, when he considered the present situation of the elder branch of the House of Bourbon, who were exiles in this country, that his Majesty could not describe, in terms of very severe reprehension, those acts which had led to this result. As to the Government or his Majesty approving of those acts, what ground, he would ask, had the hon. Gentleman for making any such assertion? If the hon. Gentleman who accused him of participating in this approbation, meant to say that he (Sir R. Peel) thought that the ordinances referred to were consistent with good policy, or with the Fundamental Law of France, the hon. Gentleman was very much mistaken; for, God knew, he could not say that such were their characters. That he lamented what had occurred in France was quite true; he did lament it, and for that very reason he deeply deplored the cause. It had been attempted in various quarters to raise a prejudice against the Government, by repeating a charge which, on a former occasion, he had intended—and he thought he fulfilled that intention—positively and unequivocally to deny. He had stated distinctly, as he thought, that no charge could be more wholly and entirely unfounded, than that the Government of this country had interfered in the appointment of Prince Polignac. He had said that, neither directly nor indirectly, had there been any interference on the part of the Government, or of any member of the Government, in the nomination of the Polignac Administration. He begged once more to repeat this statement, and to say that, in using the expression "neither direct nor indirect interference," he meant to include all possible modes of interference which could be suggested or imagined. It had been said, moreover, that the Government had counselled the issue of those ordinances which had led to the recent events in France. But the Government had not the slightest conception that it was intended to resort to any such means. Further than this, allow him to observe, that the utter secresy in which the intention to issue the ordinances was kept, precluded all interference on the part of the Government, by friendly advice, to prevent that intention being carried into execution. Upon this subject he trusted it was unnecessary that he should say more; and he thought that, with regard to France, he must have satisfied even the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hume) himself; for the hon. Gentleman must see, that the fact was, that his Majesty had expressed no regret at the events that had taken place in France; and the hon. Gentleman would perhaps, on consideration, admit that silence on the part of his Majesty, as to the character of the ordinances, was not, under the circumstances, any ground for concluding that either his Majesty or the Government approved of them. With regard to Belgium, allow him to observe, that there was a very wide distinction between the affairs of the Netherlands and those of France, as well as between the causes of the events which had taken place in the two countries. The hon. Gentleman had said, "Look at Antwerp;" but there was no mention made of Antwerp in the Speech from the Throne; and all that was said about the government of the Netherlands applied to the condition and character of that government previous to the revolt. "But (said the hon. Gentleman,) the Speech from the Throne breathed war. At the very time that it mentioned the intended recognition of Don Miguel, and the actual recognition of the French King, it would be an inconsistency, as well as an impropriety, to interfere in the affairs of Belgium." In answer to this, allow him, first, to observe, that he did not know what expression in his Majesty's Speech it was from which the hon. Gentleman inferred that we were about to interfere by war. Next, let him remind the hon. Gentleman that, with reference to this country, there were peculiar circumstances in the condition of the Netherlands. No person, with even the most moderate knowledge of history, could be ignorant that the Belgic provinces had, at one period, been under the dominion of Austria, at another under that of Spain, and at another incorporated with France; and that, whether under the one or the other, they had always been the ground on which the great conflicts of Europe had been determined. For this reason, the condition of these Provinces had always been a subject of deep interest to every State in Europe, and especially to England,—not with regard to the form of government, but with respect to their tranquillity. In the year 1814, when the fall of Buonaparte rendered a settlement of Europe necessary, the Netherlands were in the occupation of Austria, and Baron Vincent was the governor of them. The government of the Netherlands was at that time offered to the king of the Netherlands by the five Powers, on condition that they should be governed in a certain manner. Whether they had or had not been so governed was not at present the question; but these were the terms offered to, and accepted by, the king of the Netherlands. A great part of the provisions then entered into had for their object the benefit of the Belgic provinces, and the good government of the country. He would contend that we ourselves were greatly concerned in the maintenance of the connexion between Holland and Belgium. He was surprised, he must confess, at what had fallen from the hon. Gentleman opposite on that point. He was astonished to hear him assert that the separation of Holland from Belgium was a matter of indifference. He was the more surprised at hearing such an assertion from the hon. Gentleman, as it struck him that he had heard the hon. Member himself admit, upon former occasions, that the position of Holland always must be contemplated as an object of the greatest importance to England. Well, a revolution had taken place in Belgium—a contest had arisen, the object of which was, to procure the separation of that country from Holland, and, in the course of which, circumstances had occurred afflicting to all the friends of humanity. At that very moment a bloody civil war was raging between the Belgians and the Dutch, and he would ask, would it be proper, would it be wise, under such circumstances, to allow them to settle the matter themselves, and to effect whatever accommodation they could? He would put it to the hon. Gentleman, and to the House, whether, in such a case, it were unwise on the part of those foreign Powers, parties to the Treaty in 1814, which had given the Netherlands to Holland,—whether it were inconsistent with the policy and humanity of those Powers to attempt, in the words of his Majesty's Speech, "to devise such means of restoring tranquillity as may be compatible with the good government of the Netherlands, and with the future security of other States?" If any one single Power were to interfere by offers of mediation between the contending parties, it might excite jealousy, but it could not be denied that the Treaty of 1814 authorised such an interference, and that it was a right possessed by all the Powers, parties to that Treaty. Now he (Sir R. Peel) could state, that the same course of policy which had in this instance appeared advisable to the Government of England was also that which appeared advisable to the government of the King of the French; and that the other Powers, parties to the Treaty of 1814, had acquiesced in a proceeding by which an attempt would be made to bring about an adjustment of the affairs of the Netherlands, by the interposition of all those parties who were so deeply interested in the settlement of that country. So much for that topic in his Majesty's Speech. With regard to Portugal, it appeared to him that the policy which it had been determined to adopt was precisely that which the interests of the country demanded; and when the Speech from the Throne recommended the recognition of Don Miguel, it by no means implied that the slightest variation had taken place in those opinions which his Majesty's Ministers still entertained, and which they had repeatedly expressed, respecting his acts. He could assure the hon. member for Middlesex, and the House, that whenever the acts of Don Miguel had interfered with the rights of British subjects, his Majesty's Government had demanded, and had received, immediate satisfaction. Without, in the slightest degree, departing from those opinions which they had expressed regarding the means by which Don Miguel had become possessed of the sovereign authority in Portugal, his Majesty's Ministers had determined to adopt the course of policy announced in the Speech from the Throne; and was the House prepared to condemn his Majesty's Government for thinking that the time had arrived when, a certain act of justice and humanity being performed by the government of Portugal, the interests of British subjects should be consulted by effecting a renewal of our diplomatic relations with that country? His Majesty's Government had certainly refused to recognize Don Miguel until the performance of the act to which he had just referred; an act of general amnesty, on account of those political proceedings which had been directed against him while assuming the power which he now possessed in Portugal, had been promised on his part, and they had now his positive assurance that such an act was about being immediately carried into execution. They had not made it a condition of the recognition which had been already determined upon, but until that act was performed they would not make the recognition complete. Two years and seven months had elapsed since the accession of Don Miguel to the sovereign power in Portugal, and his own subjects appeared to acquiesce in his possession of that power. The interests of British subjects were seriously affected by the non-recognition of Don Miguel, and with at least the apparent acquiescence of his own subjects in his authority, was the Government of this country still to refuse to recognize him, and was it to allow the interests of British subjects to be materially injured by the continued interruption of our relations with Portugal? Looking at the matter in every point of view, he entertained a confident hope that the policy of the British Government, with regard to Portugal, would not be deemed undeserving the approbation of that House. He did not know that there were any other portions of our foreign policy into which it would be necessary for him to enter upon this occasion. He had endeavoured to confine himself merely to a reply to the observations of those hon. Members who had preceded him, being of opinion that the present was not the proper opportunity for entering into the general details. The hon. Gentleman had admitted that his Majesty's declaration respecting the

Civil List was quite satisfactory. His Majesty it would be seen, had placed at the disposal of Parliament his interest in the hereditary revenues, in those funds which may be derived from the droits of the Admiralty, and in other revenues that had been hitherto reserved to the Crown; and had trusted entirely to Parliament for a just and liberal provision for the maintenance of the honour and dignity of his Crown. He could not sit down without shortly referring to the hon. Gentleman's observations with regard to the course which had been pursued towards Ireland. The hon. Gentleman had characterized as a disgraceful act the issuing of the proclamation which had been directed against an attempt to disturb the repose of that country, and to involve it again in that agitation from which he (Sir R. Peel) had believed the Catholic Relief bill would have redeemed it, and from which, as he still believed, it would have been by that measure redeemed, if it had not been for the events at Paris and in Belgium, which had been taken advantage of for the purpose of propagating an impression amongst a high-spirited and unreflecting people, that the same success might, perhaps, attend their efforts. The hon. Gentleman had asked, was a man in that House to be prevented from moving for a repeal of the Union?—and was the hon. and learned member for Waterford, if he had got such a whim in his head, to be prevented from bringing it forward there, and having it fairly and openly argued and discussed? But such was not the course pursued by the hon. member for Waterford. That was not the way in which he had brought forward the discussion of the question; and was it, he would ask, for the indulgence of what the hon. member for Middlesex had called "a whim," that the repose of a whole country was to be hazarded, and that it was to be made a scene of confusion and bloodshed? What was not the responsibility—how great—how tremendous—he spoke not of the legal responsibility, but of the responsibility before God and their country,—which those men took upon themselves, who could excite a whole population in the manner against which the proclamation to which reference had been made was directed. The hon. Gentleman was not to suppose, that they were to be gulled and deluded into the idea that the simple object of the assembly which that proclamation put down was to promote petitions to Parliament. Had the hon. Gentleman read the declarations which had accompanied the acts of that assembly? Surely the hon. member for Waterford would not stand up and affirm of that association, that its sole object was to prefer a temperate appeal to the Legislature on the question? That hon. Gentleman had himself declared, that Ireland was not yet ripe for revolt,—that she was not yet ready to oppose force to force. Could any man, after that, doubt that the intention of that hon. Gentleman was to form a permanent association, meeting in Dublin, the object of which would be to organize the people of Ireland on this question,—to form their minds upon the subject, and to keep them in continual agitation until the time should arrive when they might look to the employment of force with success, and it would become dangerous to refuse the concession of their demands? He believed that that was the very assertion made by the hon. and learned Gentleman himself in the association alluded to; and it was because he believed it to be true mercy to put an end at once to such an attempt to organize the popular mind of Ireland, that he, in conjunction with the rest of the Ministers of the Crown, gave his sanction to the instrument for extinguishing that Association. In doing so, did he mean to deny that the situation of Ireland called for inquiry; or did he mean to say, that he was prepared to withhold his assent from such measures as he might think calculated to relieve her distresses? No such thing. He was anxious to see the condition relieved and ameliorated; but having the power to prevent the agitation he had described, and to render ineffectual the mischievous efforts to organize and inflame the people of Ireland, he, for one, dared not incur the responsibility—not of issuing that proclamation, for that he had incurred but the awful responsibility of withholding it. Let them not, by suffering such agitation to continue, prevent the accomplishment of those good effects which the healing measure of emancipation was calculated to produce. Let them not again bring into play parties and factions. Let them not revive the religious animosities which had so long disturbed that unfortunate country. Let them not trifle with a subject of such tremendous importance. Let not an inflammable population be excited by attempting the mad, but peculiarly exciting, project of a dissolution of the Union. Was it come to this, that after having, by successive efforts, improved the condition of the country by consolidating and binding together the various parts of which this great empire was composed,—after having, in the early period of our history, succeeded in putting an end to the divisions of the heptarchy,—after having united Wales to England, and subsequently Scotland to this country,—and after having consummated the great object of concord by uniting Ireland to Great Britain,—were they, after having accomplished all that, now to begin to retrace their steps and to dissolve the connexion between the component parts of this great empire? If they should begin by dissolving the Union with Ireland, what reason was there why they should not proceed to dissolve the union which had been effected with the other parts of the empire,—to repeal the Union with Scotland, and to dissolve the connexion with Wales? He should not argue this question further at present, but if ever the time should arrive when such a question as the repeal of the legislative Union with Ireland should be submitted for calm and dispassionate discussion and argument in that House, he did not despair of being able to show, from experience of the past, from what had taken place when Ireland had a Parliament of its own, and from the sympathy for Ireland which had, since that time, grown up in the English mind;—he did not, he would repeat it, despair of being able to show, by arguments drawn from all those sources, that this speculation was calculated only to raise one individual to a bad eminence, at the expense of the best blood of the two countries, and of the repose and tranquillity of both.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, the duty that I have to perform to-night is to me extremely pleasing, as it affords me some opportunity of repelling calumny, and of vindicating my own motives. I do not stand forward to claim the favour of a hearing—assailed as I have been, I should be entitled to it anywhere—but here I appear as the representative of the people, with almost as many constituents as any Member who hears me, and with more than those of all the Ministry combined. The Members of Government have carefully slunk from all populous places—scarcely one has been returned for more than a rotten borough; but I am sent here by a large body of the people, and I claim to speak as their representative. First, I appeal to every man whether the Speech put into the mouth of the Sovereign is not one of the most unsatisfactory discourses ever pronounced by the chief of a great nation? I speak of it both as it relates to foreign and to domestic concerns. I did not hear in it one word about the poverty and distress of the people in any part of the kingdom — not one word regarding relief. The rotten-borough system—the oligarchical mode of returning Members to this House is, I know, reckoned among the blessings of our condition; and for this reason, not a syllable is said respecting that distress which the right hon. Gentleman was unable to deny. If there be no distress, why is night made horrible by fires, the blaze of which may be seen from the metropolis? Why are the people in a state of disturbance and insubordination within a short distance of the very seat of Government? Is there no cause for this, and is the calumny to be pronounced upon the people of England, that they break out into acts of open violence without the pretence of suffering? Nothing is said about the alleviation of distress, and, above all, nothing about the alleviation of the distress of Ireland. But I arraign the Speech for what it says or omits on our foreign as well as on our domestic policy. We have had excuses for not rejoicing in the success of the French people, and we have been told that much is due out of courtesy to the exiled family of France. Courtesy, indeed, towards a sovereign who wished to cut down and massacre his unoffending people without pity or remorse! Regret Ministers may feel—not at the unmerited sufferings of those people, but that the efforts of the king of France were not successful in rivetting upon the French the chains of slavery. That king and his ministers attempted to take away, almost altogether, the elective franchise from the French people, and to put down the liberty of the Press. Who attempted to put down the liberty of the Press here, and to prevent the expression of the popular sentiments in Ireland? Why our Attorney-general and the Lord-lieutenant of Ireland. In Belgium I can also find some happy coincidences with the conduct of our Government at home. In the proceedings against that illustrious man, De Potter, it would seem as if an English Attorney-general had been imported from this country to frame the indictment which was preferred against him. Let us refer next to Portugal. Don Miguel is to be recognised, and why? Because he has promised an amnesty to his subjects; that is to say, he who has been bound by no oaths, is to be trusted on his honour. When will this amnesty arrive? Yes, when the dungeons have been cleared, because the scaffolds have streamed with human blood. The right hon. Gentleman tells us, that Don Miguel is king with the approbation of the people, but let us remember, that 4,000 or 5,000 British troops happened to be looking on at the time, and aided the tyrant in his usurpation of the sovereignty. There is this great difference between King Philip and King Miguel—King Philip has separated Church from State; he has dissolved the adulterous connection that injures the cause of religion wherever it exists; but King Miguel has united Church and State; and while he rules the one, he tramples on the other. The right hon. Gentleman most pitifully implored the House to tell him why this country should not interfere in the affairs of Belgium, when a civil war was raging there. I deny the existence of civil war: it is a war between nation and nation—the Belgic nation and the Dutch nation; and I do not think that, excepting the Union of Great Britain with Ireland, there is a fouler blot in the page of history than the annexation of Belgium to Holland. The people decided against it, yet it answered the purpose of the Holy Alliance to declare that 361 votes constituted a majority, and 700 votes a minority. The Government of the king of the Netherlands is called an enlightened Administration; if so, the rebels are without excuse, and nothing can justify their acts. I assert, that his administration, instead of being enlightened was odious, tyrannous, and grinding; that it refused independence to the Judges, and the Trial by Jury to the people: if any reforms were proposed they were as hypocritical as the right hon. Gentleman's reforms of the law in this country, where great evils are perpetuated by the removal of insignificant abuses. Why am I listened to, as it were with sufferance, when I ask whether such an administration is enlightened? The suppression of the liberty of the Press may, indeed, have its recommendations with his Majesty's Ministers, and with many Gentlemen who hear me. Was that an enlightened administration which decreed, that the language of Courts of Justice should not be the language of the country, and that the process should be Dutch, where Flemish only was spoken and understood? Was it a proof of an enlightened administration when the king abolished parochial schools and diocesan seminaries? Yet this is the man whom the right hon. Gentleman has so warmly lauded—who is called enlightened, while he is involved in the darkest ignorance—and who perseveres in these measures when the world is in a state of transition, and when the blind systems by which men have been oppressed for ages are disappearing before the light of science and the heat of truth. Such is the foreign policy of the King's Speech. Is there, from beginning to end, one particle of sympathy with the success of liberty—one spark of joy at the destruction of despotism? I look in vain for any recognition, however distant, of the great principle, that the people have only to be united to be successful, and that when they are determined to struggle in a just cause, the military power becomes powerless, and the arm of force is withered at the moment it is raised to strike. But if we are to interfere, in conjunction with whom are we to intermeddle with the affairs of Belgium?—With the members of the Holy Alliance? No; they have too much to do at home. If violence have not yet displayed itself, it will break out, and *la guerre sourde* will, ere long, be converted into open and avowed hostility. Great Britain would herself be at war at this moment, were she not bound in sureties of the peace to the extent of eight hundred millions sterling. I little thought I should ever have cause to bless the National Debt; but I bless it now, since it incapacitates the British Government from interposing to crush the growing spirit of human freedom. This brings me to remark, that not a word is said in the Speech regarding the reduction of taxation, the abolition of military institutions, or the destruction of the rotten-borough system. Old Sarum and Gatton are to be preserved; and, notwithstanding the formal resolution of this very day, that it is a high breach of privilege for a Peer to interfere at an election, I do not want the aid of my glass to look round me and say, "You, and you, and you, have been sent here by Members of the other branch of the

Legislature." If I have a wish to rescue my country from the fangs of an odious oligarchy, I must pursue that course which has been so loudly censured by the right hon. Gentleman. He has talked of my conduct upon a recent occasion; and held me up to be repudiated by the supporters of the King's Speech. I am content. I am vindicated before my God; and I will not condescend to vindicate myself here. [*hear, hear!*] I am much obliged by the sympathy that cheer implies: it shows that there is no necessity for a separation of the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland. I thank you. You may triumph over my country — you have triumphed— but you never will again. It is easy to triumph over the individual, and I wish you joy of it. In the King's Speech I read that his Majesty "cannot view without grief and indignation, the efforts which are industriously made, to excite among the people a spirit of discontent and disaffection." If it be meant to impute to those who take a constitutional and legal part in Ireland, that they are ill affected to the present King, I will assert that a grosser calumny was never uttered. They are convinced that there is not in the kingdom a better-intentioned man than its Sovereign. Never did Monarch receive more undivided allegiance than the present King from the men who in Ireland agitate the the repeal of the Union. Never, too, was there a grosser calumny than to assert, that they wish to produce a separation between the two countries. Never was there a greater mistake than to suppose that we wish to dissolve the connection. No; but we want a connection of authority, not of subserviency—of equality, not of submission. Ireland must be equal, not inferior—she must be a kingdom, not a province; and I declare solemnly, that I believe it would be more for the benefit of England than of Ireland that the Union should be dissolved, and that the Parliament should be restored to Ireland. It would lead me too far a-field to debate now the question of the Union; but let me ask any man what good did it ever do to my unfortunate country? I have put this question a thousand times. You answer,—it has accelerated Catholic Emancipation. I deny that; it postponed emancipation. Five preparatory Acts were passed in twelve years, and then came the Union in seven years afterwards, lest the measure should be ultimately carried. It was, indeed, tardily conceded by Great Britain, when those who long opposed it suddenly turned round, deserted their ancient adherents, and claimed the merit of liberality, for what was extorted from their fears. Does any man who hears me know how the Union was brought about? It was avowed in the Irish Parliament, that a rebellion had been fostered for the purpose, and that it cost the Government 1,500,000*l.* to buy over the Opposition. In short, it may be safely said, that all other corruptions were pure and honest, compared with the gross, bare-faced corruption which accomplished the Irish Union. Cavalry and infantry were employed to prevent public meetings; and if a design of the kind at Clonmell had been persevered in for one moment longer, the streets would have flowed with the blood of the Protestant gentry. What advantage has Ireland derived from the Union? Nothing but disadvantage. The rental of Ireland ought to be twelve millions, and no less than five millions of that sum are remitted to absentees. The productive taxation of Ireland has been diminished since the Union to the extent of three millions: although the population has more than doubled, the consumption of tea, wine, and sugar, has decreased. In short, there is not a single piece of evidence, derived from the state of the revenue, which does not prove that Ireland has been grievously injured by the Union. The Imperial Parliament has passed four Acts out of five in favour of the landlords, those absentees who extort all its wealth from Ireland. By the Subletting Act, the landlord has obtained unlimited power over the property of his tenants. By the Vestries Acts, these landlords tax the Catholic people for the support of the Protestant Church, the great revenues of which go into the pockets of their children and dependents. And what are the effects of all these oppressive laws? Look at the poverty of the people, look at the misery and distress which have been manifested at Naas, Newry, Cork, and Dublin; look at the riots at Limerick, and the starvation under which the peasantry are dying. There is deep distress, and there is disaffection in Ireland — disaffection to the Government that has oppressed — and let me tell you that you would have disturbances too in Ireland, but for the man who is looking for the repeal of the Union, and who happily possesses so much of the confidence of the people, as to be able to prevent them rising against the public authorities. Take away that influence, and what would be the result? You may send over a military Secretary to put down the public spirit by a military force, but in vain. Tell the people of Ireland that you have no sympathy with their sufferings—that their advocate is greeted with sneers and laughter—that he is an outlaw in the land—and that he is taunted with want of courage, because he is afraid of offending his God. Tell them this, and let them hear also in what language the Secretary of State, who issued the proclamation to prevent meetings in Ireland, has spoken of Polignac. If he be asked his reason for issuing that proclamation, he will answer, "My will," although, at the same moment, it would be easy to demonstrate its illegality. But I will not enter into this discussion now—I cannot trust myself—my feelings overpower me. Phrases have been attributed to me, which, if I had used, I should regret, but which I never did use; but I have no apology to make to the instruments of despotism anywhere. The right hon. Gentleman has asserted, that I said that Ireland was not yet strong enough to oppose force to force. I never said it—I never said anything like it. I am sure that he is incapable of inventing the expression, but those who have informed him, have informed him falsely. I found my country agitated by poverty and distress from one end to the other, and it has been asserted that I therefore created the cry for the repeal of the Union. How much men mistake! It would be cruel—too severe a punishment—to ask hon. Gentlemen to read all my speeches from the time I first entered upon political life—but if they did read them, they would find that the restoration of her domestic legislature to Ireland was my earliest thesis—my constant avowal. I would not revive the topic in the last Session—I was prevented in part by the discussions on the cold-blooded additions to the taxation of Ireland, in the shape of an increased stamp-duty, which would have had the effect of crushing the Press. This fact shows the sympathy of the House for the sufferings of Ireland—a sympathy of which it affords fresh evidence whenever I attempt to speak. The Irish people, seeing that they became poorer every day—that they declined from bad to worse—thought that the only chance of prosperity, was to be found in the repeal of the Union. In looking for the accomplishment of that end, who has talked of the employment of force? Nobody; but they all knew that to come to Parliament with one or two petitions was to have them neglected, and that nothing of this kind could be effectual but by the universal petitions of the people of Ireland claiming the repeal of the Union. This is the only mode by which great measures of reform can be obtained: while only a few petitions came from small towns or villages, the cause of reform in Parliament was ridiculed and scouted; but, now it is supported by the universal population of England, the whisper flies from bench to bench, that the time is approaching when it must be conceded. I think the people of Ireland aggrieved. How are they to procure relief? By petitions. How are petitions to be obtained? By magic? No; only by men meeting and associating together for one common object. Polignac never would have attempted in France what has been accomplished in Ireland; and even the king of Belgium would have refrained until, by the importation of the law of conspiracy, he had convicted De Potter. The modes we adopt, and which we wish to adopt, are legal and constitutional: we want no force but the force of reason, and we eschew all violence, even the violence of argument. Wherever we have influence, there is no disturbance; where we have no influence, there Whiteboyism and Ribbonism prevail. Let me be shouted down—take away my influence—and how will you prevent confusion? The consequences will not rest upon me—for them you alone will be responsible. [The hon. and learned Gentleman after adverting to the poverty, disease, and distress, in Ireland, and to the manner in which money was exported to absentees, referring particularly to the counties of Wicklow and Westmeath, concluded thus:] So long as the people of Ireland proceed for the repeal of the Union legally and constitutionally, they shall have all the aid I can give them. Let Ministers suspend the Habeas Corpus Act, it shall not deter me. Prepare your gaols and your dungeons; these are times when men must speak out, and I will do it. I will discharge my duty, in spite of taunts of cowardice, and threats of punishment; and I will proceed, be sure, not less firmly and resolutely, because constitutionally.

You may deprive Ireland of the poor wreck of her liberty, but you shall never make me your willing slave.

Mr. *Curteis* quite concurred in the sentiments expressed in his Majesty's Speech, and in the policy which it recommended, particularly as regarded Ireland. In these times when so much sedition was abroad, he maintained that it was the duty of the Government to restrain the liberty of the people, or the agitators in Ireland might otherwise cause a rising of the people there. He should decidedly oppose his Majesty's Government, however, if it should go to war, and not retrench. The hon. member for Waterford wished it to go forth that he did not get a favourable hearing in that House. Now he was sure that there was not a single hon. Member who had addressed the House that night who had been more favourably listened to. He protested against the sentiments which had fallen from that hon. Member with regard to the repeal of the Union. In what he had said, he believed that he spoke the sentiments not only of his constituents, but of the majority of the people of this country.

Mr. *Brougham* spoke as follows: It is with feelings of satisfaction, mingled with pain, that I feel myself called upon to say a few words on this debate—with satisfaction that the hon. member for Waterford has had an opportunity of answering that personal attack which the House has witnessed, and that the patient and profound attention with which he has been listened to, gives an ample refutation of the libel (libel I would not say, for I wish to avoid anything harsh), but the assertion against justice contained in the complaint, that its Members were determined to clamour down the arguments of the hon. Member, and shut their ears to the complaints of his constituents. It is with satisfaction, therefore, that I have listened to the able and eloquent speech of the hon. Member delivered on such an occasion; but it is with pain, with very great pain also, that I have heard that speech, because it contains a picture of Ireland, which, if not magnified in its proportions—if not painted in exaggerated colours, presents to my mind one of the most melancholy and alarming conditions of society ever heard of, or recorded in any state of the civilised world. I was indeed in some hope when I heard the lineaments of that picture, traced as they were by a hand powerful for the task, and when I called to mind that men high in office, and possessing all the advantages of communication and intelligence which that office gave them, had frequently acknowledged the accuracy of the hon. Member's information on the state of the country, and the fidelity of his representations; when I recollected all this, and heard that hon. Member describe a state of distress in Ireland to which all Europe can bring no parallel, and yet saw not one Member of the Government rise in his place and give these statements a denial, I confess I felt a pain which it is difficult adequately to describe, and without looking at the Speech which has been delivered from the Throne, I find, therefore, enough to inflict pain and create discontent. But when I examine the terms of that Speech, I find cause to raise within me all the vigilance which my situation as a representative of the people demands, and to fill me with still greater fear and anxiety for the future. Let me first, however, discharge the more pleasing office which my duty as a good subject demands from me, by expressing my heartfelt satisfaction at the line of conduct his Majesty's paternal goodness has led him spontaneously to adopt, in tendering unhesitatingly, for the use of the country, all those extensive Crown Revenues which form his patrimonial possessions, and by declaring and promising that the Civil List shall be reduced, while he at the same time gives up all these odious, unconstitutional sources of revenue and perquisites of Royalty which are to be found in the Droits of the Admiralty, the four and half per cent fund, and the hereditary revenues of every kind in Scotland and in Lancaster, and elsewhere, at home and abroad, which in former reigns the Crown has been so loath to relinquish. This declaration is to me a matter of unmixed satisfaction; and when the noble Lord who moved the Address spoke of the absence of pomp and extravagance which distinguished the present reign, and which marked his Majesty's desire to live as a plain English gentleman, I could not but stop to think whether the plaudits which followed that announcement would have been so vehement and so general if uttered in the reign which preceded the present. I now come to the more painful part of that duty which I owe to the House, to my Sovereign, and to the country, in entering my solemn protest against the doctrines contained in the Speech now before us. That Speech breathes interferences from the beginning to the end of it. It is bottomed on principles now for the first time in the history of this country acted on and avowed by the Ministers of the King. I trust it is the speech of the Minister. I have the power to call it so, and to carp at it, and cavil at it, and tear at it, and rend it to tatters at my pleasure; because, although nominally the Speech of the King, there is no principle of the Constitution better established than that it is to be regarded as the Speech of the Minister, of the Duke of Wellington, the first Lord of the Treasury. I claim it as the ancient right of the Members of this House to treat the Speech as the language of the responsible Minister of the Crown; and as such I now proceed to consider it. I say then, Sir, that the boasted declarations of non-interference are by this Speech declared at an end; and that we are called on to pledge ourselves to examine into the internal arrangements of foreign States, to discuss the state of their affairs, and to give our assent, by this Address, to a Speech of the Minister of this country blaming one government and censuring another, and making ourselves the Judges and the Censors of the conduct of Governments and of nations as free and unfettered as our own. I do not undertake the unpleasant task of criticising this performance from any spirit of party, or for the gratification of any of its feelings. If I was disposed to indulge in such a task, God wot I need not have recourse to the operose proceeding of dissecting the Speech they have put in the mouth of his Majesty on this occasion. Looking at any part of the conduct of the Ministry which assumes to itself the possession of the talent and the experience requisite for the direction of the affairs of the Government in that which they proclaim a tremendous crisis of affairs, I could not be at a loss for subjects of inconsistency on which I might dilate. But I do not assume the critic for any party purpose. I do it to warn this House and the Government (the country needs no warning)—to warn them against the fatal consequences of the path they are now pursuing. Let us see what is said:—"I have witnessed with deep regret the state of affairs in the Low Countries." Now, it is common to say in this House—"You do not pledge yourself to anything by agreeing to the Address; it is a mere form of compliment, and you may vote against it the day after if you please with perfect freedom." This is one of the solemn plausibilities which, I confess, somewhat puzzles my understanding. Not many days ago I swore at that Table the rankest nonsense which the mind of man could conceive, for I took an oath in the true intent and meaning of the words, that a man who died a century ago had no right to the Throne of these realms, and that I would resist to the utmost extent of my power all attempts of his son, successor, or successors, to recover that Throne, there being no successors whose title is to be resisted. That Statute means, therefore, absolutely nothing, although it is much to be wished that the formality was rendered unnecessary; neither does the Address, you are told, mean anything, for you may to-morrow oppose all to which you have pledged yourself to-day; but it is, therefore, that I feel it the more necessary to arouse the attention of the House to the acts of to-morrow, by entering my protest against the Speech today. The Speech goes on to say, "I lament that the enlightened administration of the King should not have preserved his dominions from revolt." I say that this is the very first time in the history of this country that the King is made to express an opinion on the conduct of a foreign population, or of the powers which administer their affairs. Why, with our hands full at home; why, with Ireland, agitated and discontented; and Kent as we have heard to-night, in a state of alarm which calls for the interference of the Legislature; why, with some places agitated, and all dissatisfied, we should turn our attention from the state of our own population to brand other nations with revolt, seems one of the strangest contradictions which it is possible to conceive. I deny that there is such paltry and impertinent intermeddling in the intention of the King of England. I rebut it as unworthy of the Sovereign in whose mouth it is put, and as unworthy of the Tribunal to which it is addressed. Would to God, however, that this little mean piece of gossipping-intermeddling had no worse end than being stigmatised as it deserves; but much I fear that it must lead incontestibly lead to a rupture of the terms of amity in which we have lived with the nations to which it alludes. I desire you would attend to the maxim—"Do unto others as you would be done unto." But let me reverse the maxim, and suppose that the king of the Netherlands should now think it his duty to reply in the same language to his subjects that the king of Great Britain is this day called on to use to us. Let us suppose his Majesty of the Netherlands addressing his States-general in somewhat like the following words: "I lament to see the unhappy state of the people of a portion of the dominions of my Ally the king of England." This would do for Kent. Let us take another part of the same subject. "I lament that the wise and paternal Government of my good friend the king of Great Britain has been frustrated in all the just and reasonable expectations it entertained on the subject of the pacification of that part of his dominions called Ireland." Or, "I lament that the people of the Empire of Great Britain generally have been so grievously disappointed on the subject of a reduction of taxation; and I grieve much that all the plans adopted for the relief of the enlightened people of Ireland have been prohibited by the tyrannical—(you have called the people of Belgium rebellious, she may call you tyrannical)—have been prostrated by the tyrannical conduct of the Ministers of the King: but I entertain a confident expectation that in a little time, the Legislative Union between the two countries, which all good men and true patriots deem to be a curse, will be speedily and totally dissolved, and Ireland left to enjoy the advantages of her own capital and her skill." If we have a right to intermeddle with the Dutch or Belgians, they have, I contend, the same right to intermeddle with us; and they may say, as we say of the States-general, that they regret to find that the Anti-Union Association (or the Volunteer Association, or in whatever name they delight)—they may say, they regret to find that the exertions of these worthy successors of the still more worthy defunct Catholic Association, to accomplish a repeal of that unholy legislative Union, have led to no satisfactory result. Gentlemen might treat these things with ridicule, but it would be otherwise if they came from the mouth of a foreign statesman; for I know no people under heaven who would resist with more readiness and with more severity—or be more ready to fly to arms to resent the slightest attempt at a parody of any portion of that Speech which we are now considering. I said it was reserved for the enlightened policy, and knowledge of precedents,—accomplishments which have been at all times displayed by the present Cabinet, to advise their Master to deliver the Speech on which I am now commenting; but I should be glad to know from whence they derive their precedents on this occasion. Is it from the precedents of former reigns? If it be, I ask, then, if there is in the history of the world an act more nefarious than the partition of Poland? But yet look to the Speech from the Throne at the end of the Session of 1774. Look to the Speech at the opening of the Session in 1774 and 1775, and mark the studied silence which prevails throughout the whole of these documents—not that the information of the Foreign Minister of that day was not as good as that enjoyed by the Minister of the present, for I believe the information of the noble Earl (Aberdeen) stands recorded in the annals of diplomacy, for the perfection of the most profound ignorance which has ever been known in that department of public affairs. Why, who is it who does not remember that on the very last occasion when his Majesty addressed this House, the Royal Speech was made to congratulate it on the unusual and profound peace and tranquillity in which every nation of the Continent was slumbering. And when was this? On the 23rd of July; four days before the explosion—four days only before the issuing of the Ordinances—four days before that Revolution, which in my conscience I believe to be the most glorious in the annals of mankind—whether we regard the promptitude with which the attacks of despotism were repelled, or the yet more glorious temperance which distinguished the combatants after the battle was over. There is therefore no comparison of ignorance between the case of Poland and that of Belgium or France. But let us turn to another period, when Mr. Pitt, the scattered remnant of whose followers the present Ministry profess to be, was at the head of the Government. France was then convulsed—the Royal Family were prisoners—the scaffolds flowed with blood—scenes were daily taking place, compared with which all that has happened in Belgium dwindles into a mere speck; Burke had declared that France was blotted out of the map of Europe; Fox and his party, on the other hand, had announced that a new light of liberty was about to spread over Europe; all classes in the country were arranged on one side or the other; and yet what was the exemplary caution and statesman-like course adopted by Mr. Pitt? Goaded by the party called Anti-Jacobins, surrounded by men opposed to French opinions, eternally harassed to adopt some decided means to stop the progress of revolution, what course did he pursue? During the years 1789, 1790, 1791, and 1792—during the whole of those years of massacre and misrule in France, there is not in the Royal Speeches to be found the shadow of the shade of an allusion to the revolted subjects of the French King; and it was not until the 13th September, 1792, that we find in short a delicate allusion—to what?—to the conduct of this bloody-minded people to their Sovereign?—No: to the sufferings of the enlightened Monarch?—No: to the just and equal administration of the laws, and the failure of the attempts at conciliation?—No; not one word of praise or of censure; but to one topic, and to one only, contained in a cautious and delicately-worded paragraph on the subject of the Declaration of the National Convention, calling on the subjects of other States to rise in arms against their lawful Governments. Have I not shewn, then, that Mr. Pitt would rather have had his right hand burnt off than have attempted to draw up such a Speech as this—have I not proved that from the time of Poland through all the momentous proceedings up to 1792, until a case arose which really demanded it, neither the Government of Mr. Pitt nor any other government ever ventured to commit the Sovereign to any reference to the proceedings of the government of other nations—until a case arose which loudly and imperiously demanded it. But my alarms are not grounded on what has passed. I wish to impress on this House, that if its Members slumber and allow the formality of an Address to prevent any expression of their opinion—if they do not make their voices heard, and frighten away his Majesty's Ministers from the course they now have in view, the peace of Europe is not worth six months' purchase, live to see it broken who may. Let us look to the passage which follows the expression of censure and praise:—"I am endeavouring, in concert with my Allies, to devise such means of restoring tranquillity as may be compatible with the welfare and good government of the Netherlands, and with the future security of other States." The security of other States! A Congress rises in my eyes, the Congress of Vienna—the deeds of Lord Castlereagh and Lord Metternich pass before me, and I call to my mind the declaration of Voltaire, that a gathering together of Kings, which I believe he calls an *abouchement des Rois*, must always be viewed with terror and alarm. But it is not a Congress to restrain France within her proper limits; it is not a Congress to prevent Belgium from uniting herself with that country to increase her power; no, this we could understand; that would be according to the precedents of Mr. Pitt; but you must not go to the North of Italy, you must go to Genoa, you must ransack the portfolio of Castlereagh, and search the records of the Holy Alliance to find a precedent for the subjects to be considered at this forthcoming Congress. "I am endeavouring, in concert with my Allies, to devise means," &c. In plain language this was saying that we, like the Holy Alliance, will take upon ourselves, in the first place, the police of the Netherlands; and in the next place, like that famous Alliance, the police of the rest of Europe. How that is to be accomplished I know not; but I suppose by a Congress, for we cannot send over our new Police—by a Congress, and subsidies, and preparations for war, and other measures of a belligerent character, all of which I am not Œdipus enough to divine. "Appearances," it is said, "of tumult and disorder have produced uneasiness in different parts of Europe," and of these appearances, says the Minister, "I do not like the aspect;" "but the assurances of a friendly disposition," his Majesty adds, "which I continue to receive from all foreign Powers, justify the expectation that I shall be able to preserve for my people the blessings of peace." A more incorrect assertion, perhaps a more unwarranted expectation never was borrowed from the archives of the Foreign Office; no, not even the celebrated and similar congratulation on last July 23rd, only four days before all France was spirited up into revolution, and burning with a bright flame of triumphant liberty. I regard it, Sir, as the duty of the Crown—I regard it, Sir, as the duty of the Minister of the Crown, to preserve for our use, for the use of the people of this country to adopt the language of the Speech, the "blessings of peace;" but I know no way in which these blessings may be more securely preserved—there is nothing, I take it, more clear, more indisputable, more unquestionable, than that a firm resolution—not to interfere with others is the best way to preserve peace; and nothing is more certain, in the circumstances of the country, to encourage war, nothing could more tend to destroy that peace, than to involve the country in foreign interference with neighbouring States. I know of no danger which can render hostilities more certain, and none more liable to bring them home to us—nothing more liable to make widespread war abroad crush and overwhelm us, than for us to adopt those principles of the Holy Alliance which are contained and embodied in the King's Speech. Let it not be said, that Ministers, the most feeble, the most unable, to manage the Government, of any Ministers into whose hands, by a strange combination of accidents, the Government of this country ever fell—let it not be said, that they who were hardly sufficient to manage the routine of official business in the calmest times—who were not able to manage the business of this House in ordinary times—will never deem themselves sufficient to manage the business of a great and complicated war; and that they who were unable to steer the bark in the fairest weather, will never court the tempest and defy the storm. Let that not be said; for I am aware that headstrong men are very apt to underrate their weakness and overrate their power, and that no men are more apt to deem failure impossible than those who cannot calculate the danger. The Ministers are but men, and they are surrounded with busy, meddling, buzzing personages, who encourage a little alarm—who think no harm can come of a little terror—who insinuate that negotiations may attract attention—who hope much from Congresses—who just wish that they may be doing something—who do not like to be doing nothing and being nobody—who wish for something to make a display in Parliament, and a puff in the public prints—and who are not at all adverse to have a Congress at *Lunnan*, which will have two or three advantages; it will enable them to be important who do not like to let other people work; who wish to have all the work and all the honour to themselves—who like to have it all their own way—to be their own Minister, their own Ambassador, their own General; and then they know that the people of *Lunnan* like to see foreigners, and they hope, by these little amusements and diversions, to tide over the Session. First, things of little importance will be made great subjects, and perhaps they are great subjects to the faculties of those who would be called on to discuss them when the Congress was assembled. With a view of preventing war we should have Protocols and Conferences, full of sound and of no meaning, but which might affect the Parliament, and call forth all the resources of the Cabinet. But let them not suppose, when they have gone so far, that they will be able to stop short just where they like; for I can assure them that, if they interfere, war will be inevitable. I must here say that, as a general principle, I will support measures that I approve of, let who will propose them, and I will oppose bad measures, let them come from whom they may. I am opposed, for example, to the repeal of the Union with Ireland, thinking that would be productive of injury to both countries, though that measure is brought forward by a gentleman with whom I act on some occasions, with whom, on many occasions, I agree—whose services I prize, and which I should be the last man to forget, and which it would be most unjust in me not to praise; but though I esteem his services, I must describe as bad that measure he contemplates, and must declare that I will oppose it. Let good measures come from what quarter they will, I will support them. So far, however, I must qualify the doctrine of its being not men, but measures, that I ought to support, as to assert that this doctrine in a monarchy is unintelligible and irrational. In a Republic, indeed, where all measures are known and discussed, either with open doors or in the streets, and where I have my *veto* on whatever is proposed; where a treaty cannot be concluded without my knowledge, where I cannot be bound by a treaty I never heard of—to make war twenty or thirty years after its date, for the defence of Belgium or of Portugal; in a Monarchy, I say the doctrine of measures not men is irrational, and men, as well as measures, must be looked to. The men may make a treaty which will make war inevitable at some distant day, unless the honour of the country be sacrificed; and as long as the men can act secretly, we must look to them and their character as well as the measures they avow. This doctrine, with this limitation, I think it necessary to lay before the House; if hastily taken up—if exaggerated—it is not done altogether rashly and unadvisedly; but it has been dictated by the King's Speech, which I did not see till within four hours. I have had no long time for reflection; but during the time I have had, I have reflected painfully on the language of the Speech, and the situation of England. I hoped further reflection might mitigate alarm; but I see no other conclusion to be drawn from the Speech, and I am alarmed for the consequences, than, that now for the first time the principle of interference, instead of the rule of non-interference, with the concerns of other nations is adopted by the Government. Let me warn the Government—let me warn the Members of this House—if the House should hesitate to discharge its duty, and meet this new principle with reprobation—let me warn the House, that the sentiments expressed this night by the new member for Sussex, who has so well and so ably addressed the House—who has candidly declared what are the sentiments of his own most respectable constituents—let me tell the Members of this House, that he spoke not only the sentiments of his own constituents—he spoke the heart-felt, the deep-rooted, the immovable opinions of the whole people of England. The people of England will not have the peace broken—the people of England will not endure that the Prime Minister should risk that peace by any fancies of his for foreign interference, for any theories of servility, or for any love to crowned tyrants; the people of England are enamoured of their own liberty, and they are friends to the liberty of others. If the Ministers must call the king of the Netherlands enlightened, the people of England will look at his acts, and from his acts they will not call him enlightened, or think a war ought to be hazarded to preserve his power. His acte are known, and the character of them is not what I think proper. He marched pending a negotiation—he marched while a negotiation was going on with his accredited agent, his son—he trepanned his subjects; he marched his armed troops to Brussels pending a negotiation, and the people were roused by this act of perfidious cruelty, and annihilated his army. The last act of his reign, his parting account with his Belgian subjects is fresh before us; it is known to the English Ministers, who call him enlightened; and if he has reduced the second city of his dominions to flames, he no doubt gratified his desire of vengeance against his revolted subjects, over whom he was no longer to reign, and against the country he was no longer to possess. I am unwilling to refer to other events; but, I ask, were these, of such a character as to call for any expressions of praise from an English Monarch? A better cause, perhaps, might be found, than that of the Belgians; their cause was not so good as that of the French; I lament several parts of their conduct; the Belgians were only beginning to suffer—the French had long suffered; I advocate not the conduct of the Belgians; I think it not so praiseworthy as the conduct of the French; I hold not the conduct of the Belgians up to imitation; I am not here to praise or defend it; but I cannot free from blame those who compel me to enter into the unseemly discussion, by making the affairs—the domestic affairs—of a foreign country the subject of a discussion in Parliament, and a leading topic in the King's Speech. I should not discharge my duty if I were not to say one word of Ireland. I declare that my opinion is decidedly hostile to the repeal of the Union. I ascribe the extraordinary excitement of the last few weeks in Ireland to the events in Belgium. There is no other way, I think, to account for the rapid spread in that country, within a few weeks, of opinions that, up to a recent date, were confined to a few shopkeepers of Dublin. I consider, however, that the events of Belgium have been misinterpreted and misapplied by the people of Ireland. The people of Ireland mistake the facts of the two cases. How men there, who, I know, are zealous friends of their country, can ground their arguments on the similarity of the two countries, or how they can be listened to with any respect, when they compare Belgium to Ireland, I cannot understand. As a zealous friend to Ireland, I hope I may be allowed to point out the discrepancy in the situation of the two countries. There never was a more violent union, a more uncalled-for and unjustifiable union, than that violent union between Belgium and Holland. The religion of the two countries was different, and even hostile; and though it may be partially different between Ireland and England, between Belgium and Holland, the religion was totally different. The language too, was different. French was spoken in one part, Flemish in another, and Dutch in a third. A speech delivered in French was answered in Low Dutch, and was followed by an oration in Flemish. The interest of the two countries was different. France was the market of Belgium; but a Corn-law was inflicted on her for the advantage of Holland. They were, therefore, totally different countries; and they were forcibly united by the Ministers and men of the Holy Alliance, and nothing but force kept them together. The people were at war against each other. In the legislature, the eighty Dutch deputies were constantly found voting on one side, and the fifty Belgian deputies on the other. In spite of all the decrees of the Congress, they were like oil and water; they were kept united for a while by agitation; but when the agitation was over, they separated again, each taking its own place according to its specific gravity. In England and Ireland the language was the same—the religion was different, but not in the same degree as in Belgium and Holland; and in the Legislature the Irish and English Representatives were never directly opposed to each other. If the Union were done away, could the advocates of the repeal suppose that the English gentlemen would continue those laws which now allowed Irish cattle and Irish corn free access to the English market? If the Union were repealed, would not Ireland get back that pure body which voted that there should be no agistment tithe—that body so pure—so uncorrupt, as not to be equalled—that body which voted that it would not pay the tithe of agistment, while it compelled the poor man to pay tithe in potatoes? I know that in some cases the tithe on potatoes was paid. If the Union were repealed, Ireland would get back this pure body, and surely it was not desirable that body should be revived. The case of the Netherlands could not apply in this instance to Ireland. I have given my opinion frankly on these subjects thus early to the House and the country, that they may at this early period, by the expression of their resolution, rescue us from the danger of war. I have no fears, no alarms, there are no evils to apprehend from the situation of France. I have no fear that the Revolution of that country should spread into this, as has been insinuated in a passage of the Speech. I think I speak advisedly, when I say that there is no danger of any such events occurring in this country. We are safe, not because of the wisdom of the King's Government—not because of the care of Ministers—not because of Congresses—not because of negotiations; but this land is safe, its Monarch is safe, its Parliament is safe, its institutions are safe—safe from the contagion we only witness at a distance—safe from the contagion of Revolution, because the Constitution has got in it none of that rottenness on which contagion can fix its hold. It has in it none of the pabulum which can support the disease. There may be a few misguided men—a few discontented spirits; but the law is sufficient to cope with them. The people, I am persuaded, are sound at heart. They love the monarchy. The people might love a republic in America, but we did not love it; we love our Parliament; I heartily wish it were purer, and then we should have nothing to fear; we preferred our limited King, our limited Crown, I will use the word prefer, because I know that it is made the shibboleth of a party: then, I say, the people of England prefer a limited monarchy, and with that an aristocracy; for an aristocracy is a necessary part of a limited monarchy, the people of England prefer a limited monarchy to the republic which may be suitable to another country. The people of England are quiet, because they love their institutions. I wish well to the rights of the people, and by these rights I am resolved to live, being ready to perish with these rights and for them; because I, for one, think these rights are understood by the people, and are appropriate to their character and temper. Limited monarchy and aristocracy are the best security for these rights, and I, for one, wish for no change; I wish for no revolution; and I speak, I am sure, the sentiments of the great bulk of the people, who love the institutions of their country, who love monarchy, and love nobility; because, with the rights and liberties of the people themselves these are all knit up together. They have a strong attachment to our form of government; and I would infinitely rather, if all these must perish, perish with them, than survive to read on the ruins the memorable lesson of the instability of the best human institutions.

Sir *H. Parnell* wished to make one or two observations only on what had fallen from the hon and Learned Member for Waterford relative to Ireland. He did not mean to follow him through all his observations, but he begged to state, that in his decided opinion, there was no general wish in Ireland for the repeal of the Union. As a proof of this he referred to the fact, that the hon. and learned Member made an attempt last year to get up a public Dinner to promote that object, and completely failed. He had advertised his meeting, he had done every thing he could to promote his object, but without success—there was no dinner. At the last general election, also, not one word was ever said of the repeal of the Union. He felt confident that the question of the repeal of the Union did not excite general interest in Ireland. He was surprised to hear the hon. Member say, that Ireland had received no benefit from the Union. What was the state of the connection between the two countries before and since the Union? Why, formerly, the trade of Ireland was under numberless restraints; and ever since the Union, measure after measure had been carried to get rid of those restraints. How any friend to Ireland could be blind to the benefits she had obtained by opening the English markets to her produce, was what he could not comprehend. Let the hon. and learned Member only fix some day for discussing the question, and he would undertake to satisfy him that Ireland had obtained a great many benefits from the Union. He was satisfied that the hon. and learned Member's opinions were erroneous. He gave him credit for his intentions, but was, nevertheless, of opinion that his plan would only add to the distress of Ireland, not remedy it. As for the consumption of Ireland not having increased since the Union, that was quite a fallacy. There were abundant proofs that the consumption of Ireland had increased very much, and at the end of last Session the committee, of which his hon. friend (Mr. Spring Rice) was chairman, had elicited much evidence of the fact that, Ireland had become richer and richer every year. He believed, in fact, that there was no country in Europe, in which, during the last few years, improvement had been more rapid. When the hon. Member spoke of the great distress of Dublin, he was convinced that in his statement there was much exaggeration. He trusted that the hon. Member would name an early day for going into the discussion, in order to put at rest the erroneous expectations that were formed in Ireland. He would have liked that the Society of Anti-Unionists, or whatever else they might be called, had been allowed to pursue its course, instead of having been put down by proclamation; and he was sure that it would only have made the errors of its views, and the errors of those who supported the repeal of the Union, more manifest.

Mr. *M. Fitzgerald* wished, before he replied to the observations of the hon. member for Waterford, on Ireland, to say a few words on the speech of his hon. and learned friend, the member for Yorkshire. He begged, however, that his learned friend would not suppose that he meant to follow him through the full, eloquent, discursive and amusing speech with which he had favoured the House. In all the latter part of his hon. and learned friend's speech relative to Ireland and the Constitution of this country, he begged leave to express his most cordial acquiescence. His hon. and learned friend had thought proper to colour and exaggerate that part of his Majesty's Speech which related to the Netherlands, but his hon. and learned friend's statements were not sustained by any arguments or facts. His hon. and learned friend could not say, that his Majesty's Speech enforced the doctrine of interference, without wresting the words from their meaning. His Majesty's Speech alluded to the disturbances in Belgium; and with respect to the Belgians he must say, that his hon. and learned friend had distorted the argument. His Majesty stated his regret that the government of the Netherlands had not succeeded, by its conciliatory measures, in pacifying its subjects. If the circumstance had been omitted, would his hon. and learned friend have been contented? His hon. friend stated, that he was averse from war, and was he convinced that his doctrine was the best to secure peace? His Majesty alluded to Belgium — a country closely connected with this—and he expressed his regret that it was involved in troubles, the consequences of which could not be foreseen. He differed from his hon. and learned friend as to his doctrines, and thought his learned friend's opinion was not borne out by facts. He laid down the principle that non-interference was the policy of this country, and he had referred to Mr. Pitt's perseverance in that principle; but were not the facts of that case against him? If Mr. Pitt had followed Mr. Burke's opinion, and interfered earlier, would he not have preserved this country from many evils? Our abstaining from interference did not prevent France from pursuing a system which ultimately plunged the whole of Europe into war. He was not an advocate for interference, but certainly, in the best periods of our history, interference had been practised. He did not say that at the present time non-interference was not wise policy; that was to be determined by the maxims of expediency, and the principle was to be acted on, if it were consistent with the safety of the country; but it was not the principle or the policy of this country in former times. During the Protectorate of Cromwell, and in the previous reign of Elizabeth this country had constantly and generally interfered in the affairs of other countries, conceiving that the proper regulation of the domestic concerns of these countries was indispensable to our own security. The hon. and learned member for Yorkshire would probably himself admit, that in the case of Poland, this country ought to have interfered; for it was contended at the time by Mr. Burke, and Mr. Fox, that we ought to have interfered and prevented its partition. The feeling of his Majesty's Ministers upon the subject was, to avoid interference as far as it was consistent with our own security. The hon. and learned member for Yorkshire had asked, why no member of his Majesty's Government had taken any notice of the distressed condition of Ireland? The reason was, that the subject was not regularly before the House on this occasion. No one could deny that there was great misery in Ireland; and he believed in his conscience, that his Majesty's Government were as well disposed as it was possible to be to look that condition in the face, and to endeavour to discover a practical remedy for it. But it was certainly inconvenient, and could be productive of no useful purpose, to introduce the subject on the present occasion; and he would, therefore, reserve his opinions upon it, until a legitimate opportunity offered for investigating it in all its bearings. There was one point of view, however, which had been taken by the hon. member for Middlesex, to which it was necessary to allude. The hon. Member had charged the right hon. Chief Secretary for Ireland, with a despotic exercise of power in arresting the progress of discussions on the subject of the repeal of the Union, by a Society regularly sitting for that purpose; and had maintained, that that was an interference with the right of petitioning. There was nothing in the proclamation which had been issued on that subject to justify such a charge. On the contrary, his right hon. friend was perfectly ready to open the door to all petitions upon the subject. But he did feel it right and expedient to issue a proclamation, prohibiting the continuance of an establishment which was a kind of Parliamentary Association in Dublin, permanently to discuss a political question. The hon. member for the Queen's County seemed to think that the existence of that Society might have been allowed. He entirely differed from his hon. friend. The hon. and learned member for Yorkshire was on one point perfectly right. The people of Ireland had been excited by the example of the Belgians; and it was his (Mr. Fitzgerald's) sincere conviction that, unless interference had been resorted to, the people might have come into collision with the authorities, and a civil war might have ensued. Humanity, therefore, demanded the step that had been taken.

Mr. *Spring Rice* denied that the protection of Ireland from civil war could ever depend on the proclamation of a Lord-lieutenant. If Ireland were in danger of such a calamity, it would require a much more active and powerful influence over public opinion to save her from it. He protested most strongly, both against the statement of danger which had been made by the hon. member for Kerry (Mr. M. Fitzgerald) and against the remedy which he recommended. Whenever, however, the question of the state of Ireland should come under the consideration of Parliament, he hoped that the question respecting the recent proclamation, and the conduct of the Irish Government would be carefully separated from that much greater, that vital question, the repeal of the Union. It was agreed by all the Members of that House—by all but one—that to the Union they must cling; that the continuance of its existence was indispensable to the happiness of Ireland and the stability of the empire; and that, if it were repealed, this country would be degraded to the lowest rank among the nations of Europe, and Ireland would be scarcely entitled to rank at all among civilized nations. This, however, was not a subject to be discussed hastily or incidentally. It required the most cool, deliberate, and dispassionate consideration. While he sincerely regretted the view which his hon. and learned friend, the member for Waterford, took of it, there was one encouraging circumstance; namely, that he was convinced no hon. Gentleman could take such a view, and entertain such opinions, and at the same time hesitate to fix an early period for the consideration of the question, when it might be discussed without personality or violence, and with that calmness and deliberation due to one of the gravest subjects ever submitted to the decision of Parliament. All that he asked was, the opportunity of full and temperate discussion, conducted on the principle professed by his hon. and learned friend—the interests of the people of Ireland; and if he (Mr. Spring Rice) showed himself incapable of proving that the repeal of the Union would be destructive of the interests, not only of the aristocracy, not only of the landed proprietors, not only of the manufacturing classes, but of the lowest peasantry in Ireland, he would consent to abandon the opinions which he at present entertained upon the subject. He was anxious to maintain the Union, firmly believing, that on the maintenance of the Union depended the prosperity of the whole empire. He would enter no further upon the subject at present, because, for the reasons which he had already stated, he was desirous to avoid a desultory discussion upon it.

Sir *Henry Hardinge* perfectly agreed with the hon. member for Limerick, that it was desirable to avoid a desultory discussion on such a subject, although he was perfectly ready to enter into it, and more especially with respect to his own conduct, in regard to the proclamation that had been adverted to; and he frankly confessed, that he abstained from noticing some of the observations of the hon. and learned member for Waterford, because he thought it better to do so than to give the remotest appearance of a personal character to such a discussion as the present. But, as he thought he perceived that great misconception existed in the minds of several hon. Members on this point, he begged leave to observe, that there had not been evinced the slightest disposition, on the part of the Lord-lieutenant of Ireland, to prevent meetings in any part of Ireland, for the fair discussion of the question of the repeal of the Union. Such meetings had taken place at Cork, at Killarney, and at other places. When one was proposed at Drogheda, the Mayor had referred to him for instructions how to proceed. His answer was, that if no disturbance was contemplated, there could not be the slightest objection to allow the popular feeling to be expressed on the subject. When, however, the hon. and learned member for Waterford addressed a letter to the people of Ireland, recommending them to establish Anti-Union Associations; when he recommended the establishment of a Society for the redress of Irish grievances, which Society was to send its emissaries into all parts of the country, he had given the Lord-lieutenant his opinion, which coincided with that of the Lord-lieutenant himself, that to allow of the establishment of such societies was to allow of the revival, under another name, of what was formerly called the Catholic Association. He maintained that the new society came under the description of those societies, which the Act for suppressing Dangerous Associations was intended to suppress. He felt no difficulty himself in drawing a distinct line of demarcation between such associations as those which he had just described, and associations of a legal and constitutional character. Had he entertained any wish to stifle public opinion in Ireland upon the subject of the Union, he should not have answered the Mayor of Drogheda, or the Mayor of Cork, that there was no objection whatever to meetings for the purpose of expressing the public opinion; although there was a great objection to allow of the formation of associations with the power of adjournment, the avowed object of which was to over-rule the constituted authorities of the country. He wished only further to observe, that, admitting the existence of great distress in Ireland, he firmly believed that the descriptions of that distress had been much overcharged. From the best information which the official returns afforded, there was reason to believe that a rapid improvement was making in the internal condition of Ireland. He had no doubt that the condition of the peasantry was much alleviated. The hon. and learned member for Waterford appeared to dissent from that opinion. He referred to the evidence in support of it. On all the best information which had been laid before the Legislature, he maintained that the condition of the peasantry of Ireland had improved, and was perceptibly improving. It might be asked what measures his Majesty's Government meant to pursue on the subject? In the last Session a report had been made by an able committee, on the introduction of the Poor-laws into Ireland, containing several valuable suggestions. It was his wish to act, as far as he could, upon those suggestions, after they had been more maturely considered by his Majesty's Government; and to use his utmost diligence to carry them into practical effect. With respect to the repeal of the Union, whenever that question was brought forward he should be prepared to express his opinion upon it; and he perfectly agreed with the hon. member for Limerick, that great advantages would result from its calm and dispassionate discussion. He hoped that, whenever that discussion took place, he should show that he was disposed to treat the arguments of the hon. and learned member for Waterford, not only with courtesy, but with the greatest possible candour.

Mr. *Hodges* expressed the regret with which he had heard the right hon. Baronet opposite say, that the distress of the districts in which it was endured was without remedy, and that their state of despair could not be relieved. Adverting to the condition of Kent, he stated, that there were two classes of the people under great distress; but that there was a third class, for whom there was no excuse, who were instigated by others to become midnight incendiaries—a character very nearly allied to midnight assassins. By acts of that nature, they hastened their own destruction. At the same time it ought to be considered, that human suffering had a limit, beyond which it could not be borne. The hon. Gentleman read a letter from a Magistrate of Kent, to illustrate the condition of the people. It was as follows:—"I was present at the affray yesterday, and assisted in seizing some of the people. They were very civil, and did not try to strike a blow at any one, though most of them had large sticks in their hands, which is perhaps to be attributed to their being aware that a great number of them were known to myself and others, as well as to a distant view of troops. We desired them to state their complaints. Their spokesmen made us feel that they were well founded. I believe from my heart it was true, as he stated, that it was a matter of indifference to them whether they perished by hunger or by the sword. They said, that if we would relieve their grievances, they would disperse. If not, worse would come. Things could not stop as they were. Amongst the small farmers who were called upon to act as special constables, a strange scene presented itself. Some would not serve because they would thereby become marked men; others said that they were ruined by taxation. The majority of them refused to be sworn in, observing that their petitions for relief had never received the smallest attention, and that the cause in which the labourers were engaged was theirs." It was the duty of all honest men to come and state truths like these. He was convinced that nothing would remedy the evil, but that remission of taxation, which could be effected only by a reformed House of Commons. Whenever that great question came again under consideration, he hoped it would receive greater support than it had received on any former occasion.

Sir *Robert Peel*, in explanation, denied having said that the sufferings of the country were such as could not be remedied. When it had been asserted that the people of England were in a starving condition, he had maintained that such was not the fact; but he had always admitted and deeply lamented the existence of severe distress. He had also observed, that, in so complicated a state of society as that in this country, there could scarcely be a time in which there would not be much local suffering.

Sir *E. Knatchbull* adverted to the deep and uninterrupted attention with which the hon. and learned member for Waterford had been heard—an attention almost unprecedented—as a proof that the people of this country, and the Members of that House were not indifferent to the affairs of Ireland. At the same time, whatever ability the hon. and learned Gentleman had shown, he was undoubtedly much mistaken on the subject of the repeal of the Union with Ireland. With respect to the outrages in Kent, there could be but one opinion of their atrocity. He wished it, however, to be most fully understood that the peasantry of the country had no part whatever in these transactions. He derived his information from various authentic sources, as well as from his own personal knowledge, and the result was a firm conviction, that the peasantry of Kent were a loyal, respectable class of persons, who would be utterly incapable of destroying property in the manner described. The magistracy had stated, that they were ready to hear and investigate cases of individual distress, and to remedy them to the utmost of their power. In such exertions they would not be found deficient, and he trusted that they would prove successful in their endeavours to remove it before long. It was not his duty, as a magistrate, to force the people to act in the capacity of constables, but he had invited and urged them to do so, and it was but justice to add, that they evinced no reluctance in adopting the suggestion. On the first day of the last Session of Parliament, he had submitted to the House a motion, which, however, had not received its sanction, nor even the support of the hon. member for Middlesex. It would, however, have removed a great many of the existing difficulties, and might have prevented those conflagrations and other evils which had proceeded to so alarming an extent.

The Amendment was negatived without a Division, and the Address agreed to.

Mr. *Hume*, in giving notice that on the bringing up of the Report he should place on record his opinion as dissenting from the Speech, said, that his reason for voting for Ministers on the occasion alluded to by the hon. Baronet, was because he believed that they were in earnest in their professions of economy; but if the hon. Baronet would now try him, he would find that his opinion was quite changed; for he was determined not again to do anything to keep in a Minister that acted so much in opposition to the wishes of the people.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, Nov. 3.

MINUTES.] Their Lordships only met this day to carry up the Address to his Majesty, which was done by the Lord Chancellor, the Mover and Seconder, and the Duke of Norfolk (Earl Marshal). Several Peers took the Oaths.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, Nov 3.

MINUTES.] Resolutions were agreed to, not to receive Petitions for private Bills after Friday, February 25th; not to read any private Bill a first time after March 21st; not to receive any Reports on Private Bills after May 9th. Resolutions were also agreed to for classifying Election Petitions.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. HODGES, the Money levied as Poor-rates, distinguishing the amount actually expended on the Poor from other expenses:—On the Motion of Sir H. HARDINGE, the amount of Customs' Duties paid in Ireland, on various articles of general consumption.

Petitions presented. Against the Returns of the Members for Rye, Perth, Maldon, St. Mawes, Dartmouth, Colne, Forfar, Wigan, Marlborough, Glasgow. For the abolition of Slavery, by Mr. GREEN, from the Rector and Inhabitants of Whittington, Lancashire:—By Lord FORDWICH, from Baptists and Huntingtonians at Canterbury:—By Lord F. OSBORNE, from Wisbeach, in Cambridgeshire:—By Mr. J. FANE, from Bloxam:—By Mr. DENMAN from Moor Green, in Nottinghamshire: By Mr. CAMPBELL, from Dissenters at Stafford:—By Lord R. MANNERS, from Dissenters at Leicester:—By Mr. PHILPOTTS, from Minchin Hampton and Chalford Hill:—By Mr. HUGHES HUGHES, from Oxford:—By Mr. BENETT, from Devizes, Wilton, and New Sarum:—By Sir G. ROSE, from Warblington, Hampshire:—By Mr. BELL, from Newcastle-on-Tyne:—By Mr. FLEMING, from Alton, Hampshire. By Mr. O'CONNELL, from Francis Studley, praying that the terms Catholic, Protestant, and Dissenter, be erased from all public records, and be no longer used in them. For the Emancipation of the Jews, by Mr. HUME, from Armagh.

IMPRISONMENT FOR SMALL DEBTS.] Mr. O'Connell presented a Petition from numerous persons confined for Small Debts in the Marshalsea Prison of the Four Courts in Dublin, complaining of the state of the Prison, and the great abuses existing in the Court of Conscience for the recovery of Small Debts in that city.

Mr. *Hume* wished to take that opportunity of asking the right hon. Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether Ministers were prepared to bring forward any measure for the abolishment of imprisonment for small debts.

Sir *Robert Peel* replied, that he certainly was unprepared to bring forward any measure for the alteration of the laws of imprisonment for debt; but the subject had been referred to the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the state of the laws, and they (being fully and best qualified for the purpose) had undertaken the very arduous and difficult task of inquiring into this important subject at the earliest opportunity, and Government had determined not to interfere until their report was completed.

Mr. *Hume* said, that the right hon. Secretary had pledged himself, several months ago, to bring forward a bill for amending the laws on this subject; still, Session after Session, passed over without anything being done, notwithstanding the numerous petitions that he (Mr. Hume) and other Members, time after time, had presented.

Sir *Robert Peel* observed, that the hon. Gentleman had no right to impose on him the duty of bringing forward a bill on any subject, or to dictate to him in what manner he ought to perform his parliamentary duties. If the hon. Gentleman saw a necessity for an alteration of the law of imprisonment for debt, or any other law, he could introduce a bill himself. He had the power and privilege of doing so. He must deny that he had ever pledged himself to bring forward any bill on this subject, but had merely informed the hon. Member, that the question, which was one of great importance, was under the consideration of the Commissioners, who were most competent to inquire into it. He really was not prepared to alter, off-hand, the most important laws of the country, without maturely considering the probable results, and receiving that professional assistance that the importance of the question demanded.

Sir *John Newport* complained of the expense incurred in the appointment of Committees of Inquiry, when the results of their labours were thrown away, and rendered of no utility, by the reports remaining unnoticed, and their recommendations of improvement passing unheeded. This was more particularly the case with the report on the Under-Sheriffs in Ireland, which, although made five years ago, had never been acted upon.

Mr. *Doherty* defended the conduct of the Law Committee, and stated, that several bills had been introduced founded on the result of their labours. With respect to the Under-Sheriffs of Ireland, a motion on the subject had been entered on the Notice paper, night after night during the last Session, and he appealed to the candour of those Gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, whether he had not always been in his place ready to bring it forward. But, owing to the lengthened debates, it had never been called on till late at night, and it was then objected to as being too late an hour for the discussion of such a bill.

Mr. *O'Connell* observed, that it was only another proof of the necessity for a better arrangement of the hours and business of that House.

The Petition brought up and read; on the question that it do lie on the Table,

Mr. *Hume* said, the right hon. Secretary had stated, that it was not his duty to bring forward a bill on this subject. He (Mr. Hume) contended that it was his duty, or why did the country pay for a Secretary of State? He had presented a hundred petitions against imprisonment for debt, but they had all been treated with neglect by the officers of Government, and he himself had been treated with contempt and insolence by his Majesty's Attorney General. From the substance of his Majesty's Speech, he had every reason to believe, that there was greater attention paid to foreign affairs than to the more important domestic concerns of the kingdom.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, that he had devoted as much time as the duties of his office would permit to the subject in question; but he would repeat, that it was one which required great professional knowledge, and serious inquiry, before the established law could be so materially altered.

Mr. *M. A. Taylor* said, that the Law Commission was not that to which the question of imprisonment for debt ought to be referred. Neither would he be willing to throw the burthen upon the right hon. Baronet. But why should not the right hon. Baronet call on the House of Commons to discuss this important subject? There were, he was sure, many Gentlemen in that House, who, if the right hon. Baronet brought the subject before them, would gladly apply themselves to it.

The Petition to be printed.

MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS.] Sir *Robert Peel* said, that before he made the Motions which were usual at the commencement of every Session, for giving precedence on certain days to Orders, and on certain days to Notices, he wished to make a few observations on the general conduct of the business of that House. It was quite evident, from the occurrences of the last Session, and it was quite evident, even from the notices which had that evening been given (all of them, he willingly acknowledged, on subjects of great importance), that it would be a matter of exceeding difficulty to devise the means of satisfactorily transacting the public business. In point of fact, the great difficulty was, for the House to find time for the adequate performance of its several duties. It would undoubtedly be a very easy matter to pass a resolution that the House of Commons should meet at ten o'clock every morning; and if to such a proposition there was no objection, but that it would interfere with the private business of the Members, that objection ought not to be considered as one of sufficient validity. His objection, however, to such a proposition was, that it would interfere, not with the private business of Members, but with their public, and most important duties. The greater part of the mornings of many of the Members of that House was occupied, necessarily occupied, by their attendance on public duties. Without in the slightest degree disparaging the importance of the discussions in that House, he was not sure that their importance was exceeded by the importance of the deliberations of those committees which were appointed to investigate and to communicate to the House the facts on which their subsequent proceedings were to be founded. He was at a loss to know how both these descriptions of duties—the duty of attending upon committees, and the duty of attending in their places in that House—could be carried on, if the House were to meet at the early hour to which he had alluded. He was exceedingly unwilling, without some absolute and imperative necessity should present itself, to propose any very material departure from the present course. But he did think, that if the House were to avail itself of the regulations which, with that devotion to the public service which had ever marked his conduct, Mr. Speaker had himself suggested to him (Sir Robert Peel), and were to meet at three o'clock, instead of at four, such a change would not materially interfere with the duties of Members in attendance on committees, while it would evidently add an hour to the period for the transaction of business in the House itself. If the Speaker took the Chair at three o'clock, and it was generally understood that the ordinary hour for commencing public business should be, without fail, at five o'clock, and if every hon. Member would lend his adherence to the plan, it did not appear to him that he could suggest anything better calculated to facilitate the object in view. This arrangement would of course render it necessary that the committees above stairs, should terminate their proceedings at three o'clock. It might also be necessary, that those committees should meet at eleven o'clock instead of at twelve. But he by no means thought that the despatch of public business would be advanced by the plan of the House meeting at an earlier hour than three, or by committees meeting at an earlier hour than eleven. In the first place, he exceedingly doubted the policy of abstracting Members of the House from the means of communicating with their constituents. The letters from the General Post-office were not delivered until half-past nine. If Members had not the period from half-past nine to eleven for the purpose, how was it possible that they could satisfactorily answer the various applications which they received from their constituents? He was by no means prepared to say, that extreme pressure of business might not render some other arrangement necessary; but he should be very unwilling to go any further than his present proposition, without some urgent necessity, and after mature consideration.

Mr. *Brougham* observed, that he had had it in contemplation to propose a more extensive plan, for the purpose of securing that the House should proceed to the consideration of public business with that freshness of their faculties, and of their bodily strength, so necessary for the purpose. He was quite ready, however, by way at least of a beginning, to adopt the suggestion of the right hon. Baronet, and he would, therefore, postpone his own plan. He begged to return Mr. Speaker his thanks, in common, he was sure, with every hon. Member who heard him, for the very considerable addition which he had himself proposed to make to his own duties. When the short period which Mr. Speaker had, at present, for repose and recreation was considered, the great sacrifice of an hour of that brief period, was one which the House and the country would know how to appreciate. He would merely throw out one suggestion: what was to be the case if Forty Members were not assembled at three o'clock? Was *ipso facto* an adjournment of the House to take place? That, however, was a difficulty which a little consideration would probably remove.

Colonel *Davies* observed, that when it was known that subjects of great importance were about to be discussed in that House, such, for instance, as the abolition of slavery, petitions naturally poured in from all parts of the country. Now, were such petitions from the people to be received by the House, or were they not? If they were to be received, it was evident to him that it would be impossible for the public business invariably to commence at five o'clock. Two Sessions ago he had proposed that no petitions should be presented until the Orders of the Day had been disposed of; after which they might be presented, with as long speeches as the hon. Members by whom they were presented pleased. It was a common thing in the last Session to see public business postponed until nine, or half-past nine, by the presentation of petitions.

Mr. *Hume* said, that it was necessary to adopt some measures to prevent the public business from falling into the same state of arrear in which it had unfortunately got during the last Session and the Session which preceded it. To accomplish that object, he should propose, that the House, besides sitting an additional hour each day, should also make Wednesday and Saturday days of business [*cries of* "*No no.*"] He admitted that it might be inconvenient, but where public duty and private convenience clashed, it was incumbent upon the representatives of the people to sacrifice their own convenience to the just claims of their country. He was convinced, that if the two days which he had named were added to those on which the House already sat, they would, with the additional hours which the House was going to sit every day, be sufficient for the transaction of the public business. There was, however, another improvement which he begged leave to suggest to the present system. To allow Gentlemen to get through the business of the House properly, one hour ought to be allowed them for dinner. For instance, after meeting at three o'clock, they might proceed with business till five o'clock. At that hour they might adjourn till six, and then meet again. Under the present system of meeting at four, and going on without any adjournment, he had often suffered, and he had no doubt that other Members had also suffered, great inconvenience. When a great question was likely to come on, he had often been glad to make his dinner off a dozen pears. On such occasions he had often seen a House of two or three hundred Members reduced in a few minutes to a House of thirty or forty Members. Nay, when even the greatest eloquence was addressed to them, he had seen the benches deserted, and questions compulsorily postponed, because there was no audience to listen to the discussion. And why was that? Because dinner was ready. He thought, that if a certain hour were set aside for dinner, more Members would attend regularly to their duties than did at present. Indeed, it was almost impossible, under the present system, for a Member to attend to his duties in that House, and to his duties as a member of its committees. He often went to a committee at eleven o'clock in the morning, and remained there till after three o'clock. He then came down to the House with petitions which he had to present, and there he was often obliged to remain till five, six, and seven o'clock. Now, was he to go away with his petitions unpresented, or was he to remain in the House fasting? He frequently had remained fasting in the House for sixteen or seventeen hours at a time; he had done it not merely fifty, but 500 times. How few were there whose physical strength could stand such abstinence and such exertion? For himself, he believed that he had now got accustomed to fasting. Why should they not adopt the practice followed in other legislative assemblies,—as, for instance, in those of the United States? There a bell rang for dinner at five o'clock, and as soon as it rang, the House was emptied immediately, even in the middle of a fine sentence. "I think, Sir," continued Mr. Hume, addressing himself to the Speaker, "that in justice to you, we ought to adopt a similar system, as it is well calculated to meet your convenience. All those who know the constant attendance which you are obliged to give every morning, and the perpetual reference which is made to you on points of form from the different committees which are then sitting, know that an hour and a half is all the time that you have out of the twenty-four hours to take exercise in. Now, the system which I venture to recommend must be more comfortable to you, for it must be convenient to you, Sir, to retire at five o'clock to a comfortable dinner, such as you no doubt like to have. If an Act of Parliament could prevent Gentlemen from feeling inconvenience when they went without their dinners, it would be all well enough. Such an Act of Parliament might indeed, be passed, but under the present constitution of the human stomach, it would be nothing but a dead letter. When business is to be done, it is necessary that we should approach it in that calm and equable temper which no man can possess who has gone without his dinner. I have heard it observed, over and over again, by strangers who have visited this metropolis, and who have some how or other also visited this House, as a most extraordinary occurrence, that as soon as the dinner hour arrives, no inducement can prevail upon Members to stay in the House to listen to the discussions which may then be going on. We have often matters of the deepest interest before us, which induce many to stay who are generally absent from our discussions. But even then what is the general practice? Why, Members stay in the House till seven o'clock; then, as the hour of dinner is fast advancing, they pair off till ten o'clock. At that hour they return again to their places, and give their votes upon questions on which they have not heard the debate. As this is a new Parliament, I hope that the House will feel it incumbent to take some measure to change the practice upon that point. If it does, I think that we may compress into a narrower compass much of our discussions, and do much more business than we have done in any of the late Sessions. Dining is a matter of pleasing gratification to many—to me, it is a matter almost of indifference. But any one who saw the manner of conducting business last Session must see the necessity of making some alteration in our mode of proceeding: common decency prescribes for us a new course, as the whole country is crying out that our old system was a shame and a scandal to the House of Commons." The hon. Member then proceeded to advise his hon. friend, the member for Waterford, not to press his motion for an adjournment every night at nine o'clock. He thought that a very useful compromise might be made, and he for one was ready to make it, provided the House would adopt his suggestions, and his hon. friend would abandon the strictness of his motion. He thought that they ought to meet at three o'clock, as had been suggested by the right hon. Gentleman—that they should occupy themselves with private business till five; that they should adjourn till six; that at six they should meet again, and proceed with public business till twelve o'clock, it being distinctly understood that no new matter was to be taken after eleven o'clock. By such an arrangement, any man, whether he was in a public office or had only private business to attend to, would be able, on retiring at twelve o'clock at night, to rise in the morning in a fit condition to meet the duties of his office. He said that it was impossible for any man, with less than an iron strength of constitution, to discharge his duty as a man of business properly, at an early hour of the next morning, if he had been compelled to pass the greater part of his night in that House. Let hon. Members just recollect how business was often transacted at a late hour. He had seen, more than once, seventy Orders of the Day disposed of after midnight; and he had often felt himself obliged to sit up to a very late hour, for the mere purpose of stopping the discussion on matters, which, if he had not interposed, would have been passed without any inquiry into their merits. He should suggest, as an Amendment upon the present system, that whenever petitions were presented, one Minister of the Crown, at least, should be present to listen to their contents. He admitted, that this might be imposing a severe duty upon them: but as the House was going to retire at an earlier hour than had been usual in late Sessions, and as they would, in consequence, be exposed to much less labour than they had hitherto been compelled to undertake, he thought that they ought not to have any objection to take upon themselves this new but not unnecessary duty.

Mr. *Brougham* said, that he rose to put a single question to his hon. friend, the member for Middlesex, protesting at the same time against his hon. friend's plan for sitting six days in the week,—a labour which no strength but that of his hon. friend, or of himself, or other men of an iron frame, could undergo, no matter whether he was a Minister who had the public business to transact, or a private Gentleman who had nothing to attend to but his own concerns. Protesting, then, against his hon. friend's proposal for sitting on Wednesdays and Saturdays, he would now proceed to put one question to him regarding his dining scheme. Having found easy means to empty the House of its Members at the hour of five, by the ringing of one bell, he wished to know whether his hon. friend had got another bell, of power to bring back to their duties at six o'clock, those Gentlemen whom he had called away at five.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* also expressed his conviction, that the public business could not be conducted as it ought to be, unless some change were made in the present system. Almost all the important business was now brought on after midnight, and thus it happened, that few subjects of paramount interest obtained the discussion which they required. He had been earlier and later in that House than any other Member present, always excepting his hon. friend, the member for Middlesex [*Cry of "No, no."*] He repeated the assertion, and contended, that he had lost a great deal of his time in the House in listening to dull discussions on petitions, which could lead to no useful practical result, when the discussions ought rather to have been reserved till the matter of them came before the House in some shape in which it might produce an useful practical result. He thought that petitioners had no right to expect that a full discussion should take place on their petitions when they were first presented; on the contrary, he thought the House ought to abstain from entering into such discussion. There was another grievance, of which he thought every Member had a right to complain. When fifty or sixty Orders stood simultaneously together, no one, who wished to be present at the discussion of any one of them, could be absent during any part of the time that the House was sitting, and every body knew that it sometimes sat from four o'clock in the afternoon to four o'clock in the morning. If such a person were absent for a single hour, it was very likely that on his return he would find that the question on which he wished to express his opinions had been disposed of in silence during his absence. He therefore thought, that the Orders of the Day ought, in future, never to be taken out of their turn, but should come on in regular rotation; and that no preference should be given to any of them, merely because they had reference to the public business, or were brought forward under the auspices of Ministers.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that he had heard various suggestions on this subject, which he thought were impracticable, and that of the right hon. Gentleman appeared to him equally impracticable. But there was one mode in which he thought it would be possible to get through all the business of the House, and the mode was this;—Let three days in the week be appointed for doing all the business of the House, and three days on which Committees should sit, and the House not. This, at all events, was clear, that on Wednesdays and Saturdays the Committees might sit, and the House not; and if to these two days another were added, there might, in all cases, be an effective attendance. As to the hour at which the House rose, he found that the present practice of sitting late was of very modern date. It appeared from the Journals, that up to 1791 the House of Commons generally met at two or three o'clock. The Chair was generally taken at two; at least so said Hatsell. In 1738 there were 100 Members present, and the Speaker in the Chair, at eight o'clock, on an important question; and in March, 1738, the debate was thought late because it began at eleven o'clock. In 1695 there was a Standing Order that no new business should be taken after one o'clock; and in 1698 it was determined that the Orders of the Day should be read at twelve o'clock. The first day on which candles were used in the House was the memorable 4th of December, 1641, which was remarkable for King Charles the 1st coming to the bar of the House. He had conferred with his constituents, and they required an early adjournment, in order that it might be possible to get through the business of the next day. He had mentioned nine o'clock for the adjournment, because it would take about an hour to persuade Gentlemen that he was in earnest. He had no objection to sit until eleven, but to a later hour than that he could not consent with the approbation of his constituents. He would, therefore, take measures that the House should adjourn at eleven o'clock, so that Members might be in bed by twelve.

Mr. *Maberly* expressed a hope that some of the right hon. Gentlemen opposite would give an explanation as to whether the Orders of the Day would be taken in future in rotation, and without preference to those brought forward by the Government.

Mr. *Hobhouse* said, that the lengthened discussion in which they were now engaged, was a good practical illustration of their mode of doing business. He thought that by the regulation now proposed by his hon. friend, those who were inclined to shirk their duty would shirk it still, whilst those who were not would not receive the slightest benefit from it. The only result of it would be, that it would give the Speaker an opportunity, of which he was at present deprived, of taking refreshment. He thought that it would be for the benefit of the public if the House should take measures to place in the Speaker's Chair, when he was unable to attend from indisposition, some other Member, especially appointed to supply his place; either the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means or some other member whom the House might select. He did not know whether this could be done consistently with the forms of the House; but the individual so appointed should take the Chair only on occasions of indispensable necessity.

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* rose, in consequence of the manner in which the hon. member for Abingdon had called upon the Members of his Majesty's Government to give some explanation respecting the practicability of always taking the Orders of the Day in rotation. Speaking without any regard to his own personal convenience, but from his sincere conviction, he must say, that if the House were to come to such a decision as the hon. Member called for, it would preclude the Government from carrying on the business of the country. For instance, the business done in the Committee of Supply was often of indispensable necessity; but if that business could only be taken as it came on in the Orders of the Day, six weeks might elapse before the Minister who had to propose it could bring it under the consideration of Parliament, and then, when he had once lost his turn, he would be unable to regain it for six weeks more, in consequence of the manner in which the Orders of the Day would be arranged. His feeling was, that on a question of this importance they ought to act cautiously in their experiments. As to the dinner-plan of the hon. member for Middlesex, the objection to it had been so well put by the hon. and learned member for Yorkshire, that he felt it unnecessary to press it further. In conclusion, he expressed a hope that the House would agree to make the experiment which had been proposed by his right hon. friend.

Mr. *Maberly* said, that the right hon. Gentleman had misunderstood the suggestion which he had thrown out. He had proposed that two days in the week should be devoted to the Government business alone; such a regulation, he was convinced, would be advantageous, both for the Government and the House. It would also obviate the objection which the right hon. Gentleman had just started.

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* said, that he certainly had not understood the hon. Member to have made such a statement as that which he had just offered to the House. But even that statement did not get rid of all the objections which he had to the hon. Member's scheme.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that regulations, he was convinced, would not remedy the evils complained of, unless hon. Members would use their own discretion in addressing the House. He was afraid, too, that the public would not be satisfied unless Wednesday were added to the days of public business.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* said, that in the whole of this discussion it appeared to be taken for granted that the petitions presented were indispensable, and that the number of them could not be diminished. Now, this was a very great mistake. It was in the power of the House to lessen the number of petitions, by taking away the causes of those petitions. If the House would consent to parliamentary reform, to the reduction of taxation, and to the abolition of slavery, the only question remaining would be, how they should occupy their time.

Mr. *N. Calvert* said, it was evident that a discussion like the present could lead to no practical result, and he begged to suggest that a Select Committee should be appointed to consider the mode of conducting the business of the House.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* complained, that though he had 13,000 or 14,000 constituents, he could never get an opportunity of speaking, except upon the presentation of petitions. He was ashamed to say, that he was in a sort of dose when his hon. friend (Mr. Hume) began his speech; but when his hon. friend talked about dining, he awoke up directly, at the sound of the word, as being an Alderman, it was natural he should. His hon. friend complained that others had prevented him from taking his dinner; but let him tell his hon. friend, that he (Mr. Hume) had often, by his long speeches, prevented him (Mr. Alderman Waithman) from dining. That his hon. friend did a very great deal of good in the House, he should be the last person to deny; but he was quite sure that his hon. friend took up no very small portion of the time of the House in doing it. He wished his hon. friend would visit the city, and dine for a few weeks with the citizens. That would, perhaps, give his hon. friend a salutary fit of the gout, and lay him up for a week or two, and then they would see whether his observation were not correct, and whether, in the absence of his hon. friend, the public business could not be got through much more speedily,—he would not say better; the fact was, that while those Members who had the faculty of speaking half a dozen times in the course of a night persisted in exercising that faculty, no regulations would do any good.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, that all that had taken place during this discussion confirmed him in the opinion he had expressed at the outset,—namely, that the question was one of extreme difficulty. All that could be hoped for was, that hon. Members would use their individual discretion. Any Gentleman might, if he pleased, detain the House for four or five hours, and unless Gentlemen would curtail their speeches, or the House put down the practice of enlarging unnecessarily upon fertile topics of argument and oratory, he did not see what good any regulation could answer. They had got now into the habit of printing almost every petition, and the reason assigned for this course was, the prevention of lengthy discussions upon petitions; yet, since this plan had been adopted, he was sure that debates upon petitions had been considerably lengthened. All that could be done by way of regulation on the subject was, as it appeared to him, to give up two hours to private business,—the public business being brought on always at five o'clock. At the same time it should be understood, that any Gentleman who thought proper might present a petition at any other period of the evening, if there should be no public business before the House. After all, however, almost every thing must depend upon the individual discretion of hon. Members, who could do much more than any regulation could effect towards the attainment of the desired end, if they would address themselves fairly and seriously to the subject under debate, laying aside all extraneous matter, and not indulging in surplus eloquence which never carried conviction with it, and which often tended rather to obscure than to throw light upon the subject before the House. Some of the suggestions that had been thrown out were, he thought, obviously impracticable. If, for instance, they should agree to adjourn the House for an hour, at five o'clock, in order that Members might take their dinner, such a regulation would, he was sure, make no alteration in the dinner-hours of the majority of the House. They who were accustomed to dine at seven o'clock, would still dine at that hour, and not between five and six. Then again as to the proposal of the hon. member for Waterford (Mr. O'Connell) of setting aside three days for private business, he thought they would rather lose than gain by that arrangement. It was impossible to get through the public business in three days, and the evenings of the three days devoted to private business would be spent in some other way, and not in that anticipated by the hon. Member. Indeed, he did not see how Gentlemen who had been attending committees all day could be expected to devote their evenings to a similar employment. What he proposed, therefore, was, that the House for the future should meet at three o'clock; that the time from three to five should be devoted to private business; and that the public business should always commence at five o'clock. If, however, this did not meet the wishes of the House, then he thought the only course to be taken was to appoint a Select Committee on the subject, as his hon. friend (Mr. N. Calvert) opposite had recommended.

Mr. *J. Wood* begged to know, whether there was any understanding with regard to the hour of adjournment. If there was, it ought to be made a Standing Order. He begged also to know, whether Wednesday was to be added to the days of public business, and whether, during the time set apart for receiving petitions, one of the Ministers of the Crown would be always present.

Sir *R. Peel* thought it impossible to fix any hour for the adjournment of the House. A regulation of that character would, he was convinced, be extremely mischievous. They must not make it peremptory to break off in the midst of a discussion, no matter how important and how pressing that discussion might be. It would be better to leave it to the House to determine, on motion made at the time, whether they should adjourn or continue to sit. As to adding Wednesday to the days of public business, his only objection to that was, that he thought it beyond the strength of hon. Members to sit for five days in succession. If it should be insisted upon that Wednesday should be a day of public business, he was quite sure that on Friday hon. Members would find themselves too much jaded—too much exhausted, to apply themselves to the public business, so as to transact it in the manner its importance required. He could not, as he thought the House would see, promise to be present every day during the presentation of petitions. The duties of his office would not allow him to make any such promise. This, however, he would promise—namely, that he would do all he could, consistently with his duty to the country, to be present every day.

Mr. *Hume* said, that the right hon. Gentleman was not the only Minister of the Crown. All he required was, that some Minister of the Crown should be present during the presentation of petitions.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* thought the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Hume) took a very extraordinary view of this subject; for if a petition related to a matter connected with the Home Department, the presence of the Colonial Secretary, or the Chancellor of the Exchequer, would not be much more desirable than that of any other Member. The way, however, of obviating the inconvenience which the hon. Member appeared anxious to guard against was, as it appeared to him, obvious enough. When any hon. Member had a petition to present which he thought required the attention of Government, let him make a communication to the Minister to whose department the subject-matter of the petition belonged. This would ensure the attendance of that Minister.

The usual Sessional Orders were agreed to, it being understood that after Thursday the House should meet at three o'clock.

REPORT ON THE ADDRESS.] On the Motion that Lord Grimston bring up the Report on the Address,

Mr. *Maberly* said, that he rose to enter his protest against the very extraordinary Speech they had heard from the Throne. He called it extraordinary, because he thought that nothing could be more extraordinary than for the Ministers to put into the mouth of his Majesty a Speech which omitted all mention of reform, and of reduction of taxation,—the two topics which agitated the whole empire, from one end of it to the other. He would show the right hon. Gentleman opposite that he was not insensible to the propriety of his suggestion respecting speech-making in that House. He would make a short speech, and not dwell uselessly upon any but important topics. He must, however, be allowed to say one word upon a topic which was not connected with the matters which he had risen for the purpose of addressing himself to. He alluded to the question of repealing the Union with Ireland. It appeared to him that to agitate such a question could lead to no good, but that, on the contrary, it was calculated to open afresh those wounds which late measures, he had hoped, and still hoped, would perfectly heal. After this observation he would address himself to the two topics he had before mentioned. First, his Majesty, in his Speech, said nothing about reduction of taxation. The word economy was used in the Speech as usual; but so it was last year, and yet they had no reduction in consequence. He meant, no reduction in consequence of any thing in the Speech; for he was convinced that the reductions which were effected had not been contemplated by the Ministers, but were forced upon them by the voice of the House. This was all owing to the labours of the Finance Committee having been stopped. Then, as to reform, how had the Ministers treated the country? He did not know whether it would be considered irregular for him to allude to what had taken place elsewhere, but they must all be aware, that in another place, a Minister of the Crown had distinctly said, that there should be no reform. Nay, this Minister had gone further, and described the present system as an excellent one,—as a system which worked extremely well. That it did work well he was ready to admit. It worked well for governors, but it worked very ill for the governed. For instance, how was he represented? He resided in Surrey; and that county was said to send fourteen members to Parliament. Now by whom were these Members sent? The two for the county, two for Guildford, and two for Southwark, were sent by the people; the two members for Haslemere were the nominees of a certain noble Lord; the two members for Gatton were the nominees of another noble Lord; the two members for Ryegate were the nominees of two noble Lords; and the members for Bletchingly were the nominees of a large coal-owner. Now was this condition of representation such as the people ought to endure? They had last night passed a resolution, that Peers should not interfere in the election of Members of that House; but was not such a resolution a mere farce, when compared with facts like those he had stated? Scotland was an instance of the want of reform. Not one Member of Parliament sent from that county represented either the people or their property. But the Prime Minister had told them that reform was not necessary and that there shall be no reform. He would ask, how could his Majesty expect a tranquil reign under such circumstances? His Majesty was made to express his confidence that he should transmit the constitution unimpaired to posterity, but he hoped that it was not in the way meant by his Prime Minister, but that his Majesty should transmit a reformed Constitution to posterity. In this speech, with which the public had been so much disappointed, there was hardly a man in the country who did not expect the introduction of some moderate reform. He would ask those Members in that House who had constituents, whether they would not commit a gross dereliction of their duty to their constituents if they did not at once raise their voices against those nominees of Peers who were sent into that House to overpower the representatives of the people. If his Majesty would not reduce the taxes and reform the Parliament, he was likely in twelve months to be the most unpopular Monarch that ever sat upon the British Throne. In saying so, he was convinced that he only gave expression to the feelings of the people of the whole empire. He was firmly impressed with the conviction that the tranquillity of the country would not continue undisturbed unless there were both a reform of Parliament and a reduction of taxation. Those who opposed reform might accuse the advocates of it of being desirous of introducing revolutionary principles and doctrines, but the time might shortly arrive when the advocates of reform could turn round upon them and say—"You who are against granting those rights and privileges, which not the lower orders only but all the middle classes of society in this country demand, you may cry out against the reformers as revolutionary, but it is you that are bringing in a revolution, by refusing to reform the Parliament." From his knowledge of public opinion, he would say, that they would have to repent grievously if they allowed the present Session to pass over without granting that which the people claimed. He would put it to those Members who really had constituents, whether they would allow the nominees of Peers and of coal-owners, to overpower them in that House.

Lord *Eastnor* observed, that it was not inconsistent for the King to omit, in his Speech from the Throne, any recommendation of Reform, for such a recommendation, he believed, had never been made in a King's Speech during the last 200 years. With respect to reform, about the necessity of which so much was now said, he must declare that he had never seen any plan to which he felt he could accede, and he believed few of those who advocated it were agreed upon the sort of reform that was necessary.

Mr. *Tennyson* said, he was one of the Members who sat for one of the rotten boroughs of Surrey, alluded to by his hon. friend, the member for Abingdon; but his votes always had been, and always should be, given solely with a view to promote the interests of the people. Yet he was not base enough to contend, even for a moment, in favour of the continuance of that degraded system on which the popular opinion had on various occasions been recently pronounced; and though there might be no inconsistency in the omission of a recommendation of reform in the Speech from the Throne, the Ministers who framed the Speech must be afflicted with a terrible blindness indeed, if they thought that reform was never to be conceded to the people of this country. A Minister of the Crown had last night said, that while he was Minister the people should not have reform proposed to them by the Government. He warned the Ministry that it would not long depend on the behest of the Duke of Wellington, whether reform were granted or not. A time would come, when popular opinion must prevail over the counsels of Ministers; and he could only express his fervent hope, that the Government would not irritate the people, and that the people would have more discretion than the Parliament, and would not allow themselves to be precipitated into the path of violence. There were some parts of the Speech which he was happy to be able to praise; he alluded to those parts which related to his Majesty's putting at the disposal of the Commons the revenues of the Crown. His Majesty had given up his personal revenues, as the Marquis of Camden had done on a former occasion. The noble Marquis had set a glorious example, and one which ought to be imitated. He must take that opportunity of saying, that there never had been a service that more demanded a favourable notice from the Sovereign than that of the Marquis of Camden, who had sacrificed his personal interests for the public benefit. He approved of that passage of the Speech which related to France, but was much disappointed in that which referred to the Netherlands. The public feeling of the country had been embarked in the cause of the oppressed Belgians; and under these circumstances, it was impossible for the Minister to use language more calculated to excite the indignation of the people of the whole of England, than that language — so repulsive to their wishes, and so repugnant to the real feelings of the King — which they had put into his mouth. He meant, therefore, in respect to that paragraph which related to Belgium, to move an Amendment, declaratory of the principle of non-interference. Such language was most unfit to be put into the mouth of the Sovereign, who had just ascended the Throne; but his conduct had shewn that that language, so opposed to the opinions of the people, was not the language of the King, but of his Ministers. The hon. Member said, he would move at the proper time, that instead of the fifth paragraph of the Address, relating to the Netherlands, the following be inserted :—

" That we lament, with his Majesty, that the Administration of the King should not have preserved his dominions from civil discord; but derive consolation from the hope that means may be found to restore tranquillity without any violation by the British Government of the wise principle of non-interference with the internal condition and public institutions of other countries."

Mr. *John Wood* observed, that he had the honour of being the Representative of a great population, who had given him their free and unbought votes. He would tell the House the spirit in which that population would receive the Speech from the Throne. It would be in a spirit (to borrow a phrase from the Speech itself) of " grief and indignation." There were particular passages in the Speech that were unexceptionable, but to others he must most strongly object. He believed that the hopes of the Ministry were in the fears of the alarmists, and the latter was probably the cause of the adhesions sent in a few days ago by certain great Peers. The same thing had occurred in 1798, and had been made use of then, as it would be made use of now — to check reform. He trusted, however, that such schemes would be defeated, and that Parliament would refuse any supplies to the amount of a single farthing of our money, or a single man of our army, to be sent abroad, for the purpose of interfering, either between the King of Holland and the Belgians, or between the Belgians and any other nation. With respect to Don Miguel, if the Portuguese liked him, why let them have him and welcome: there could be no objection to the Government recognizing him, but the Government ought not to trust him; there was blood on his hands, he had violated his oaths, his promise of amnesty was not to be relied on, and the excited Portuguese could not depend upon it when given by him, though guaranteed by the British government, when they recollected how Ney had been murdered after the capitulation of Paris. He wished that House to tell the King, that they viewed with " grief and indignation," certain things which now existed; and if he were asked what were these, he would point to the interference by Peers in the election of Members of Parliament; he would point to Stamford, to Ilchester, and to Newark; and would say, that those noble Peers who, in defiance of the Constitution, interfered in the election of Members of Parliament, were the men who excited dissatisfaction and discontent. In answer to the noble Lord who had said it was not inconsistent for the King to omit any recommendation of reform from his Speech, he would merely observe, that it was not only omitted from the Speech, but in a commentary on the Speech, given in another place, reform was positively and flatly refused. The Dictator of the Government had declared, that the people did not want reform, and should not have it. In the name of the people, he replied, that they did want reform, and that they would have it. He did not mean to deny, that the repeal of the Union might be a foolish scheme; but still he would assert, that the people of Ireland ought not to be prevented from meeting to discuss it. If the Duke of Wellington thought he could easily prevent meetings in this country on the subject of reform, he was mistaken. He had spoken of alarmists. He could not deny but there were some strange coincidences in the conduct of our Government, and of the late Ministry of France. The first article of impeachment against them was, that they had interfered with the elections, and had in that manner attempted to deprive the people of their civil rights. Was there no alarming coincidence here? He thought there was, and he advised the Ministers not to lay the flattering unction to their souls, that the Chamber of Deputies was the only place in which such a charge could be advanced. The Speech from the Throne then referred to the Constitution. Why what was the meaning of "the Constitution of this country?" It was nothing more than that form of government which each administration recommended the Sovereign to adopt. It was said, that the King acted according to the Constitution when Charles 1st demanded payment of Ship-money. In the same manner the Constitution was preserved when James 2nd proceeded against the seven Bishops; and in the time of William 3rd it was thought that the Constitution could only be preserved by the introduction of Dutch Guards. The Parliament, however, was of a different opinion, and the Dutch Guards were dismissed. In the reign of George 1st, the Constitution was again preserved by passing the Septennial Act, extending the power of the Members, by their own will, to seven years, though their constituents had elected them only for three. In the reign of George 3rd, it was according to the Constitution, no doubt, that the attempt was made by the King to tax America without allowing her representation. To be sure he lost the colonies in the attempt — and after the loss, the Constitution was just as perfect as before. The Constitution, in fact, still exists, and the country was only taught that Kings and Ministers could accommodate themselves to circumstances which they had at a former time declared would be the destruction of the State. In the reign of George 4th the House was told, that the Constitution would be lost if the Dissenters should be admitted to places in Corporations. The measure was, nevertheless, carried by the good sense of the House, and what was the result?—why, the Constitution was not worse, but a great deal better for it. Catholic Emancipations came next, but there was a loud outcry against it, and it was said that the Church and State were alike ruined, and that the Pope would reign in London. Yet the Relief Bill was passed, and a Speech was put into the King's mouth, in which that measure was hailed as one essential to the preservation of the Constitution. He therefore felt no alarm for the safety of the Constitution; and he was satisfied, if the House effected a reform, that Ministers would come down as usual, and that his Majesty's Speech would declare, that he had the happiness to transmit it, as he had received it, unimpaired to his successor. The Speech, however, which his Majesty was yesterday advised to deliver, would, he was quite sure, excite indignation throughout the country.

Mr. *Leader* said, that when he saw the gentlemen of influence and of property in England rising around him to express the feeling which his Majesty's Speech was calculated to produce on their constituents, he could not imagine but it would be some consolation to the people of Ireland, even though there was nothing in the Speech from the Throne which was calculated to awaken their hope, yet it surely would be some consolation for them to know, that their cause was not without advocates, and that there were amongst their Representatives, those who deeply sympathised in their state and sufferings. If it were the duty of the people to obey the law, it was no less the duty of their Representatives to inquire into the causes of its infraction. Representatives ought to be the natural guardians and protectors of the people, and he unhesitatingly declared that Ireland was now reduced to a situation requiring the strongest exercise of wisdom and of honesty to prevent her being rapidly precipitated into evils, out of which it would be extremely difficult, or perhaps impossible, for her to extricate herself. It was his duty to state, in few words, the causes which appeared to him to have induced this distressing state of things in Ireland, and to assure the House of his sincere and anxious desire to do so with the strictest attention to impartiality and truth. It was known to the House, that from the memorable period of giving free-trade to Ireland, to the time of the Union, no instance could be found of a nation progressing with rapidity equal to that country; and it was also known that a great portion of that prosperity had been obtained by the aid of the protecting duties and bounties which the resident Parliament of the country had given to its manufactures. When, according to the Treaty of Union, these protections and duties ceased, there was a considerable portion of manufacturing labourers of necessity thrown out of employment; and it unfortunately also happened, that about the same time a tremendous decline took place in the prices of the produce of land. If, when the protecting duties and bounties in favour of the manufactures of Ireland ceased, the prices of produce of land held up—or if, when the prices of produce declined, the manufactures had been preserved—Ireland might have contended with one of those evils, although it had been out of her power to successfully wrestle with both. It was not, however, by the reduction of the prices of produce, and the extinction of her manufactures exclusively that Ireland suffered. During the war Ireland had been the theatre of extraordinary expenditure—not less than from four to five millions annually, in the military, ordnance, and commissariat departments. This expenditure, unfortunately, happened to be withdrawn at the time that the protecting duties ceased, and likewise at the time that the prices of the produce of land were so greatly depreciated. Whilst these revolutions were in progress, the frightful and most afflicting malady of Ireland—absenteeship—progressively and rapidly increased;—so that, at one and the same time, the extinction of manufactures, the reduction in the price of the produce of land, the diminution in public expenditure, and the desertion of the country by the landed proprietors, all operated together to depress the industry of the country, and withdraw from circulation the immense sums which gave a stimulus to industry, and assisted in reconciling every person to his condition in the country. Besides these causes, which had an injurious operation on the prosperity of the country, and which it was impossible to overlook, there was another of considerable importance. Whilst the right hon. Secretary for the Home Department was Secretary for Ireland, he appeared to be impressed with the conviction that it was essential that Ireland should be placed in the full possession of her great national capabilities and resources. Although he never had the honour of the most distant acquaintance with that right hon. Gentleman, he must say, that it was well understood, and highly creditable to the right hon. Secretary, that, whilst in office, he gave easy access to any gentleman disposed to promote the industry of the country, and was willing to aid every enterprise which could be accomplished without loss to the public. The money expended in public works in Ireland was undoubtedly of great advantage, not only to Ireland, but to the United Kingdom. But, although the advances were in general repaid by instalments, still the benefit of a gentleman high in office, taking a deep interest in the development of the resources of the country, was of inestimable value, and of the highest importance. And another and a powerful cause of the present disturbed state of the public mind may very safely be ascribed to the abandonment of a system of which the right hon. Gentleman was the author, and which, without subjecting the empire to the smallest pecuniary loss, was of immense advantage in relieving the people, and in encouraging the development of the resources of the country, so as eventually to triumph over its distresses. Besides these causes, which have had a severe operation on the prosperity of Ireland, there is one remaining cause of the distresses of the country, which must be corrected, or the country could not by possibility be relieved. He did not ascribe to taxation alone the pressure of distress under which Ireland laboured; but he came at once to the broad proposition, that the charges on Ireland were incapable of being met by the existing means of the country, and that it was become actually necessary, not only to diminish the burthens of the country, but to give facilities for industry, and remove every impediment which stood in the way of its improvement. When the word "charges" was mentioned or complained of, it was at once supposed that the word charges related entirely to State taxation: the charges on Ireland, however, consisted of revenues, tithes, local taxation, rents to absentees, rents to resident landlords, and vestry and various other charges, such as Quit and Crown rents, &c.

These charges together were probably little short of twenty millions annually, and when deducted at any time, or the most prosperous times, from the means of Ireland, left little remaining for the accumulation of capital in the country, or the subsistence of the people. At present it was matter of notoriety, that the manufacturing industry of the country had failed, and the landed produce of the country been greatly reduced in price. Was it to be expected that the same charges which were created whilst prices and means existed which were sufficient to discharge them, could be now paid, when the prices of agricultural produce were reduced, and manufactures extinguished? When the fund was reduced, was it reasonable that the charges should be continued without reduction likewise? Of the revenue, he would only say that when the rents of land, and the prices of the produce of land were, prior to the Bank Restriction, the same as at present, the nett revenue of Ireland did not exceed a million annually, and it was now at least five millions, and by many persons stated to be at least seven millions annually. Of the Church, every person knew, that it had not only been placed as the first charge on the land, but its income increased. Of the local taxation, it was beyond all dispute that, in the money of 1830, 1,000,000*l.* was equal to the entire sum raised for the payment of all demands levied by Parliament, for the whole Government in Ireland, at the period when the Duke of Wellington commenced his public life, and when the rents of land, and the prices of the produce of land were about the same as at the present moment. As for the charge for rent, the rents remitted to absentees had frequently increased, but on all hands there appeared to be only one opinion concerning the rents of the resident landlords, which must be still considerably abated. On the subject which was now agitating the minds of the people of Ireland, and which had been alluded to in his Majesty's Speech, he must be permitted to say, that it was excited by no Belgian spirit, nor, in his humble judgment, was there any necessity for the proclamation lately issued to avert the evils of civil war. He had attended one of the most influential meetings in Dublin, called by the Lord Mayor in the last summer, at which every banker, merchant, and gentleman of Dublin were present. It was called for the purpose of expressing the decided opinion of the country against further taxation, and especially against the projected increase, which would have led to the ruin of the Press. Even at that meeting a disposition was evinced favourable to the Duke of Wellington, on account of his having passed the Relief Bill; and he believed in his conscience that it would be owing to the expressed determination of the Government to persevere in its projects, and to the declaration of the Duke of Wellington, that distress was periodical, and that he intended no relief for Ireland—should the cry raised for the repeal of the Union gather strength and consistency. He was the Representative of as free a constituency as any in existence—returned without any solicitation; and his constituents had left him free to use his own discretion on that important subject; which should be considered a striking illustration of the forbearance and good sense of his enlightened and independent constituency, for the city of Kilkenny was the centre of the woollen manufacture of Ireland before the Union, and its inhabitants were now confessedly reduced to the deepest distress. Under these circumstances, he implored the House to interpose its agency between the wants of the people and the power of the Crown. The people of Ireland must be employed; to employ them would extend the manufactures and wealth of England, for all that tended to develope the resources of Ireland equally added to the strength of England. He admired the manly and true English spirit of the members for Kent, who, while they reprobâted the midnight excesses of incendiaries, at the same time fearlessly told the Ministers of the Crown, that unless the distresses of the people were relieved, they would find them supporting the cause of Parliamentary Reform, and compelling them to reduce those burthens by which the industry of the country was so grievously oppressed. He had himself had the misfortune of living in a district where civil war had raged in the same manner, and it would be found, on the evidence of Committees of the House, that while farm-houses were burned, and mansions were attacked all around him, the employment which he had afforded to the people kept his family in security, and preserved the peace of his estate. The hon. Gentleman concluded by again impressing on Ministers the necessity of advancing money to be expended in public works, and in developing the resources of the country.

Sir *John Bourke* attributed much of the agitation in Ireland to the dissatisfaction into which that country had been thrown last year by the propositions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. That cause was happily removed, but there still remained great distress in the country. He hoped that the Government would not continue in the course which had already lost Ireland her situation in the scale of the powers of Europe, and lowered her proper rank in the British empire. She was destroyed by taxation. He could say, that in the country he came from, there was no spirit of disturbance, but the people expressed their opinions and sentiments fairly, without exhibiting any spirit which could lead to animosity or tumult. The late proclamations had caused disturbances, as might have been very well foreseen, and it was in vain to think of tranquillizing Ireland by proclamations, for if the substantial causes of agitation were not removed, agitation would not cease. The means of restoring tranquillity to Ireland would be, to give employment to the poor; but whilst the population of that country was idle and destitute, all hopes of tranquillizing it were vain. The people were anxious for employment, more than for any political changes; he was persuaded that they did not wish for a repeal of the Union, if they could only obtain justice from England. Amongst other causes of discontent in Ireland, was the unfortunate separation between the rich and the poor, between whom there unhappily existed no bond of union or sympathy. The discussion of the question of the repeal of the Union could, he thought, be attended with no good consequences, and he regretted to hear any comparison between Belgium and Ireland, these countries being placed in circumstances altogether different.

Lord *Morpeth* said, he had a few observations to make which he should take the liberty of doing without transgressing the salutary order suggested in the course of a long debate, as to the best means of shortening their labours. He found, from the speeches upon all sides, that the state of Ireland required great attention and considerable relief. Relief and attention he hoped it would experience, but, in the mean time, the patriots of the two countries should oppose themselves to measures which could only lead to separation and exhaustion. That passage of the Speech which related to the affairs of Belgium was the sore part, for, if there was one principle which the people of this country more deliberately recognized than another, it was the principle of non-interference. So strongly was his mind impressed with this conviction, that he had only been anticipated a few moments by his hon. friend, the member for Westminster, who had given notice of a motion on the subject. He rejoiced, however, that it had fallen into such able hands. It were much to be wished that Ministers, who displayed such a fondness for interference, would transfer it to the Debates of the House of Commons, and indulge it less in relation to foreign countries. But, leaving the chapter of our foreign politics to turn to that of our internal affairs, he could not but be of opinion, that within that House, and more especially out of doors, the minds of all men were deeply impressed with the conviction, that the present were times of alarm and pregnant with danger, and that the whole surface of the world was in an excited state. In how many quarters were there now in progress scenes of great agitation. It would be in vain to deny, and in some cases vain to regret, that important political changes were going on, though in some instances sufficient provocation had not been given for the alterations that were producing, and he could only express his satisfaction, that in this country there was no just ground of alarm on the score of disaffection to the government. In turn this country might be subject to change; transitions might be painful, and re-actions might mar for a time the blessings which they produced, and yet he hoped that in this country amendments would be effected without danger. Tyranny might have cause to tremble, but the people of this country were attached to their own institutions, and little disposed to encounter changes which, even in cases that called for their application, were often attended with circumstances which rendered their advantage questionable. He must contend, that if a rigid economy were resorted to, and if Ministers no longer continued to refuse a reform in the Commons House of Parliament, little danger could be apprehended to the institutions of this country. Unless Ministers were prepared to introduce such measures, they would pronounce against themselves the severest sentence of incapacity which could be uttered. If, however, they were ready to concede all that justice demanded, and all that the situation of the country required, they might then take their stand against all unsafe concessions, and they would then have with them all the mass of the good sense, the virtue, and the intelligence of the country. The House would give him leave to add, that as nothing human could be made the subject of accurate calculation, making timely concessions was the only way to acquit themselves of responsibility and to guard against reproach.

Mr. *Weyland* argued, that the cause of the distress amongst the lower classes was the want of sufficient capital to employ them. When the labourer had to depend entirely upon his wages, his support must necessarily depend upon the quantity of capital in the market. At present our population was increasing, and our capital stationary. If the population went on increasing, while capital decreased, misery must be the result. The only remedy for this state of things was, to place the productive labour of the country upon such a footing that it would be the interest of every man to save and employ capital, which was the only remedy that could be applied to the evil. He did not mean to contend that distress was universal, but it was more generally diffused, and more poignant than Ministers seemed to imagine. The hon. Member recommended the giving handsome wages to labourers, which would return a proportionate equivalent to their masters.

Mr. *Robinson* said, that it was of importance at the present moment that every Member of that House, however inadequate might be his abilities to venture upon discussion, should declare his opinion on the situation of the country. They had then met under circumstances of no ordinary difficulty, and it was the duty of every man to render assistance, by offering his advice to Ministers and to the House, upon the present emergency. He should not enter into the details of the Speech, but he would express his serious apprehension of that passage of it, to which that part of the Address related, which it was now proposed should be amended. The right hon. Gentleman had declared that there was no intention of interfering hostilely in the affairs of Belgium, and he believed that his Majesty's Ministers had no such intention, but he distrusted their ability to steer clear of such interference, if they at all mixed themselves up with the Holy Alliance or its affairs. Could the right hon. Gentleman give an assurance that, if he interfered as a mediator—and interference in the concerns of foreign Courts, had too often brought distress and misery upon this country—he would not, in the result, find himself in such a situation, as that he would be obliged to come down to the House with a declaration that it was necessary for the honour and dignity of the Crown to enter upon hostilities? The people of this country were not prepared for a continental crusade. He would put it with earnestness to every Member of that House, whether there was not enough to occupy the attention of Parliament in our domestic concerns, without being continually engaged in the discussion of continental politics. The hon. member for Yorkshire had said, last night, enough to satisfy the House of the inexpediency of interference, and he should, therefore, dwell no longer upon the subject. He was certain that every Member must feel the necessity of repressing the disorders which prevailed in some parts of the country; but he for one could not help deploring that Ministers had not advised his Majesty, on this the first occasion of his meeting the first Parliament of his reign, to follow up his allusion to this subject by some expression of sympathy for the sufferings of the people. In the last Session of Parliament he had repeatedly pressed for inquiry into this subject, and he was now convinced, that if hon. Members deluded themselves with the idea that things would come round again of their own accord, they would be guilty of a base dereliction of their public duty. A great portion of the evils of the country had been brought about by a mistaken legislation — by enormous taxation on the productive industry of the country, and by corn-laws, which, however requisite for the protection of the land-holder, were wholly incompatible with the rate of wages of the lower orders. He trusted the House would not suffer the Session to pass over without turning its attention to the subject, with a view to provide employment for the poor, or to facilitate the means of their purchasing the necessaries of life, by a revision of the corn-laws.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* said, that he

would not have taken up the time of the House on that occasion, if he did not think it necessary to express, in the name of his constituents, his disapprobation of some portions of the Speech from the Throne. No one had entered that House during the present Session with a stronger feeling in favour of supporting the Address than himself, if he could do so consistently with his duty; but it was at the same time matter of deep regret to him that the Speech omitted any notice of the distress into which the country was plunged. His sentiments had been so much better expressed, however, by the noble Lord who was member for Northampton, and by the hon. member for Yorkshire, that he should not detain the House by again going over the same ground. He would therefore proceed at once to enter his protest against the intention of any interference in the internal affairs of Belgium. Such interference was directly opposed to the sentiments of the public at large, as he could gather from the conversations he had heard in the city on that very day. It was impossible that he should not be acquainted with the sentiments of vast numbers of people, and if he did not represent them to the House he would soon hear of it in a voice of thunder. He had hoped that Ministers would have brought forward some measure of reform—that they would, in short, have yielded in this instance, as they had in others, to the pressure of circumstances. Their not having done so verified the old adage, that individuals profit by experience, but governments never. It was with deep sorrow and regret that he learned from another quarter that there was no intention on the part of Ministers to support any measure of Reform. The hon. Member then referred to the case of Gatton, to show the necessity of Reform, and said, it was notorious that its representation was regularly sold. He did not blame the proprietors, for, if the borough were his own, he should do the same. He only stated the fact to show the necessity of Reform. If they would not concede this measure, the day would come when they would no longer be able to resist it—when it would come upon them like a thief in the night. He trusted the Government would re-consider the subject, and retract the opinion it had given. One hon. Member had attributed the distress of the country to a contraction of capital; and he agreed with him in this, but he disagreed with those who thought that any reduction which could be effected in taxation would have the effect of removing the distress. The evil originated in over-production and consequent want of employment; and some remedy for this must be found before the distress of the country could be relieved.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* could not concur in the Amendment, although he expressed his disapprobation of that part of the Speech and Address which related to the affairs of the Netherlands. He would not give any opinion as to the merits of the quarrel between the King and the people in that country—he would not give any opinion on the subject of the affairs of France, but at the same time he thought, if we considered the situation of matters as they stood at present, that the words of the Royal Speech were calculated to do infinite mischief, instead of restoring tranquillity in the Netherlands, and effecting the union of the two countries. His Majesty was made to talk of three-fifths of the population of the entire country as revolted subjects. We talked of these men as revolted subjects, and yet these were the men who had raised armies, taken towns, and attacked citadels. The persons at the head of the Provisional Government were those with whom we should have to treat if we were really in earnest in our wish to tranquillize the Netherlands. If ever any treaty were to be made, these men must be parties to the negotiation. Such words, then, as those used in the Speech were, to say the least of them, unnecessary, and impolitic, when it was so easy to adopt another mode of expression. It would have been proper to state, that his Majesty regretted, that the attempts of the King of Holland to bring about a reconciliation with the people of the Netherlands had failed. On the subject of the revolution in France, he believed there was but one opinion, but upon that of the Netherlands he knew that a considerable difference of opinion existed. However, we should take the authorities in the Netherlands as we found them, and we should not use any language in speaking of them, which would tend to excite irritation, or throw obstacles in the way of that amicable negotiation which it was, he presumed, desired to set on foot; for he could not bring himself to believe that the Government of this country intended any other, and he took the earliest opportunity of stating, that as a Representative of constituents, he would never consent to the shedding of one drop of English blood, or the expending of the smallest coin of the realm, for the purpose of forcing the king of Holland on the people of the Netherlands. He did not mean to say, that the words of the Speech necessarily conveyed an intention of war on the part of this country, they referred rather to mediation; but then it was not the usual custom of mediators to begin by threatening and calling names. He must, therefore, think that the use of the words "revolted subjects" was, to adopt the phrase lately used in another country, most "inopportune." [*Some Members said,* "*untoward.*"] No; the word to which he referred was "inopportune;" for he would ask, with what face could we proceed to mediate or negociate with parties whom we first branded as "revolted subjects?" The spirit of the treaties to which we had become party was, to guarantee the united kingdom of Holland and the Netherlands from foreign aggression, but no armed interference between the subjects of these two countries was contemplated. We were not called upon, therefore, by these treaties to take any part in the contest between the king of Holland and his Belgic subjects. The chief thing we had guaranteed was the integrity of the two countries, united under one government; but let it be considered that his Majesty had himself submitted the question of the legislative separation of these two portions of the kingdom to the States General, and that their High Mightinesses had decided in favour of the separation; so that, in fact, the very thing which we were called upon to guarantee—the union of the two kingdoms—had been broken by the consent of the King and the States General. There was only one other point in the Speech from the Throne to which he would advert, that was the point relating to the Union between England and Ireland. He was most strenuously opposed to the dissolution of that Union, because he felt convinced that, if carried into effect, it would be the ruin of Ireland. He had not yet heard one good argument in favour of such separation. If it were said that the interests of Ireland were not attended to in that House, he must deny it. He denied that there was any want of attention to those interests, or any want of inclination on the part of the English Members to do every thing that could be done for Ireland. If more were not done, it was because the means did not exist, and because sufficient assistance was not given to that object from Ireland itself. The cases which had been cited by the hon. and learned member for Waterford, in support of his view of the question, were those of the Subletting Act, and the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders. These had, no doubt, been productive of much individual suffering, aggravated by the unfeeling conduct of many of the Irish landlords. But the Subletting Act was, he might say, the act of the Irish Members themselves, and it was unfair to throw upon others the blame of a measure which had not worked so well as was expected. The English Members had taken a warm interest in Irish matters, and, for his own part, he would say, that he had been one of the first, not an Irish Member, to oppose the equalization of the duties as to stamps in the two countries, by raising those of Ireland to the level of those duties in England. One word as to another argument of the hon. member for Waterford. That hon. and learned Member complained of the facility given to the landlord to eject his tenant for non-payment of rent. Nobody could doubt, that the landlord had the clearest right to eject his tenant if his rent were not paid; and if the expenses of that process were reduced, it must be a benefit to the tenant, who ultimately would have to pay them; yet the hon. and learned Gentleman, who declared himself a legal reformer, complained of the reduction of the expense of an ejectment from 17*l.* to 22*s.* 6*d.*, and he would bring back the blessing of the heavy expense, to frighten landlords from bringing ejectments for non-payment of their rent. If this were the hon. and learned Gentleman's notion of legal reform, if this were his cheap law, he certainly could not concur with him in his opinion of either. Yet this was also one of the arguments urged by the hon. and learned Gentleman in favour of a repeal of the Union. He did not object to the hon. Gentleman for having an opinion in favour of that repeal. The question was a constitutional one, and he only wished that he would fix a day to bring it forward, and have the sense of the House taken upon it. There was a precedent for such a motion. In the House of Lords, soon after the passing of the Act of Union with Scotland, a motion was made for leave to bring in a bill for its repeal, and it was lost only by a majority of four. He would say, that if the hon. and learned Gentleman should have the whole of his minority amount to four, he might think himself very lucky. He had heard too much of the public and private conduct of the hon. and learned Member to impute to him any improper motive. The whole of his life showed that he acted for what he considered the interest of Ireland. He had done much for his country, as much, in fact, as King, Lords, and Commons; yet, giving him credit for what he had done, he could wish that he would confine his efforts for the repeal of the Union to the walls of that House, and that he would use his great eloquence and his powerful influence, to persuade that House, rather than to form societies out of it, such as had existed in Ireland, and that he would abstain from such a practice as the collection of rent, to be employed for any purpose, legal or illegal. The principle was a bad one, and might lead to dangerous abuse. In conclusion, the hon. and learned Gentleman again expressed his objection to that part of the Speech and the Address which referred to the people of Belgium.

Mr. *Cripps* said, that the allusion made in the Speech to the present state of Belgium could not be construed into any intention of war on the part of this country, and he was sure no such intention existed. The words of the Speech referred rather to the disposition of Government to restore tranquillity there by mediation, and that was very natural on the part of Government with respect to a country in which we felt so deep an interest. He must take that opportunity of expressing his regret at the delusion which existed amongst some of the labouring classes, and which led them to acts of riot and outrage; but he was sure that they were urged to those depredations by those who should have given them better advice; and he was convinced, that notwithstanding what had occurred in some places, the mass of the people were sound at bottom. As to Ireland, it was in a much more tranquil state than the exaggerated accounts of some individuals would lead the public to believe. The agriculturists of that country were every day getting an increased vent for their produce, to the great disadvantage of the British farmer and grazier, but to the great advantage of Ireland generally. He knew that lately vast quantities of cattle had been imported from that country into Gloucestershire, and, indeed, Ireland was now so closely linked with this country, that it was impossible for the latter to be prosperous unless the former was also prosperous. A great deal had been said about the word "enlightened," but he thought hon. Members had not sufficient means of judging of the character of the government of the Netherlands. His Majesty's Ministers possessed, no doubt, a better opportunity than many Members of knowing the nature of that government. He did not know what objection could be taken to the course proposed by Ministers, of offering themselves as mediators between the people of Belgium and the king of Holland. If they went so far as to enter upon a war, detested at the present moment, and deprecated by all Englishmen, it would be then time enough to oppose them. He was happy to hear that part of his Majesty's Speech which recommended economy, and he hoped that recommendation would be followed up by proper deeds; if it were not, he should think the Administration undeserving of the confidence either of the King or the country. On the whole, he should be ready to agree to the Address.

Sir *George Murray* said, it had been remarked at the commencement of the evening by his right hon. friend (Sir R. Peel) that brevity in their addresses to the House would very much facilitate the progress of the public business; and to prove that he fully concurred in the propriety of the remark, and the necessity of attending to it, he would, at least, in what he had to say, set an example, and be brief. A great deal had been said upon the subject of Ireland; but it had all been incidental, for it did not flow naturally out of any part of the King's Speech, nor had he heard it said, that the topic ought to have been introduced into the Royal Speech. He would not, therefore, go at length into the subject, but he would take that opportunity of saying most positively, that the repeal of the Union ought not to take place. England and Ireland were so intimately and so inseparably connected, that even the idea of separation ought not to be entertained. He must also state his firm conviction, that every measure which had been proposed for the improvement of Ireland had received the most patient and the most anxious consideration of that House. He rejoiced to know that this was the fact, that the interests and the welfare of Ireland were most dearly cherished, for he was convinced that what was for the benefit of Ireland was for the benefit of the empire at large; and that man was the best friend to Great Britain who improved and gave prosperity to Ireland. The great source of injury to Ireland was this; no sooner was one subject for agitation disposed of, than another was mooted. He trusted, however, that the attempt now making to excite discontent in Ireland, and to effect a repeal of the Act of Union, would prove futile. He had no doubt it would, although it might for a short period create annoyance. Many remarks had been made upon the consequences of the Subletting Act. He did not, however, see how those consequences were to be avoided. There might be some harshness in particular cases, but he knew not how those cases were to be singled out and provisions made respecting them. The distress occasioned by the Subletting Act was the natural consequence of the change from the old system to the present one, and could not be of long duration. He would not further occupy the attention of the House upon that point, but proceed to notice that part of his Majesty's Speech which referred to Belgium. He thought that some hon. Gentlemen had looked with a jaundiced eye at that part of the Royal Speech, and that they had drawn an alarming and threatening picture, which was unjust, and not warranted by anything which had been said by his Majesty. He could not conceive how it could be contended, with any shew of justice, that the language complained of threatened or referred to war, or to military interference. The paragraph would admit of no such construction, without being wrested from its manifest meaning. The great principle of his Majesty's Government, with respect to foreign affairs, had been that of non-interference. He did not mean to say that it was impossible for a case to arise in which his Majesty's Ministers would not feel it a duty to interfere, but such a case would be the exception, and he hoped a very rare one, to their conduct, and not the rule. With respect to Belgium, he must say, it formed no such exception; and his Majesty's Speech, in his opinion, indicated nothing to justify alarm, and the various fears which had been expressed. It was true, that no portion of Europe was more interesting to this country than the Dutch and Belgic provinces. The former had long been closely connected with us, and the latter were the objects of our peculiar solicitude; and when his Majesty alluded to treaties regarding those countries, his Majesty referred to the treaties made between the different Powers which had taken part in the pacification of Europe, and all of which were deeply interested in the maintenance of peace. It was impossible this country should forget those treaties, which were made for pacific purposes, so that England should detach herself wholly from the system of Europe. He was quite ready to admit, that it was desirable for this country to interfere as little as possible, but occasions must and would arise upon which it was necessary for England to appear and exercise her just influence. And what were the expressions used by his Majesty? Objection had been made to the phrase "repose of the world." Surely there was nothing in the expression calculated to excite alarm; nor was there anything in it indicating a thought or a wish for war. The policy of Government had been throughout pacific—nay, the Government had been reproached by its opponents for not interfering with the affairs of foreign nations. What had been said of the conduct of Government in not interfering with Portugal? And if it had interfered in the manner which some had wished, how could it, looking at the precedent which would have been established, have been able, in justice, to hinder the late king of France from assembling his followers and proceeding from the shores of this country to France? The principle which he was favourable to was this: let this country be the asylum of misfortune; let the expatriated foreigner, whether king or subject, find a place of refuge in England, and let him receive all the attention which humanity can suggest, but let nothing be done to mix up this country in the quarrels of other nations: such was the principle he would act upon. The hon. member for Kirkcudbright had found fault with the word "revolt" as applied to the conduct of the Belgians; but surely there was nothing very censurable or unusual in the expression, for did not history speak about the revolt of the Belgians from the Crown of Spain? He could see nothing objectionable in the words used by his Majesty. Some hon. Gentlemen seemed to think that the treaties alluded to in the Royal Speech had been made by the Holy Alliance. Such was not the fact. This country had never been a party to the Holy Alliance, and the treaties referred to had been agreed upon by those Powers which had taken so active a part in the pacification of Europe after the late arduous war. This country had never adopted the system of the Holy Alliance, but, acting with its allies, it had endeavoured to secure the peace and happiness of Europe, and not to create war and tumult. Upon other points objections had been taken to his Majesty's Speech. The hon. member for Abingdon found fault with the Royal Speech because it did not speak of a reduction of taxation. He thought it would have been premature had his Majesty spoken of any such reduction. A reduction in the taxes could be made only after a reduction in the expenditure had been effected, and therefore the latter reduction ought to be made before the former was spoken of. Again, his Majesty's Speech had been objected to because it contained no allusion to Parliamentary Reform. But surely the omission was a very proper one. Upon Parliamentary Reform there was a great variety of opinions, and it was much better for the Government to let the subject come, as it undoubtedly would—and there was a specific notice of motion upon it already given, before the House—than to take up any particular position with respect to it in the Royal Speech. Upon the subject of a Reform in Parliament, he would, if he might be permitted to allude to what had fallen from a noble Lord opposite last night, say, as that noble Lord had said upon another matter—he would listen attentively to the propositions which might be made, and he would adopt that course which he really believed to be the most likely to benefit the country. Upon the subject of reform, he had his own general opinions, but he would shape his conduct as he thought best for the interests of the country. The hon. member for Preston had complained that the Government had acted presumptuously in advising his Majesty to speak of the Constitution as unimpaired. He thought the charge without any foundation. The expression, as he understood it, did not mean that any defects which might be discovered were not to be removed, but that the great principles of the Constitution were to be maintained. He did not believe, that the great principles of the Constitution had been departed from in the repeal of the Test-acts and the removal of the Catholic disabilities; but he thought that they had been adhered to by the extension of the blessings of the Constitution to those people who had before been excluded from participating in their enjoyment. He confessed himself friendly to a Reform in Parliament, which would secure an efficient and a good system of government to the country. [*Cheers from the Opposition benches.*] But let him not be misunderstood, as he found from those cheers he might be. He was not favourable to any great extension of the elective franchise. He was willing to admit, as an abstract principle, that every man had a right to a voice in the government of the country, but he contended that for practical purposes it was wise and proper that that right should be confined to comparatively a small number of the community. He contended also that the system now in use had worked well; if it were said it had not, and required alteration, he asked how came it that the country had gone on so prosperously under it, and achieved the highest rank in the scale of nations? He repeated that he wished not to be misunderstood, or to receive credit with any party for opinions which he did not entertain, and was not ready to support. He considered a powerful and influential aristocracy essential to the maintenance of the best interests of this country. He did not feel it necessary to inquire how far the influence of an individual of that aristocracy might have been used with propriety or not; but he was convinced that the influence of the aristocracy in general ought not to be confined to that House, which appeared to be peculiarly intended to represent it. If it were so confined, he was convinced that it would soon decline, and be found inefficient for the purposes for which it was intended.

Sir *R. Gresley* thought, that the general complaint against his Majesty's Speech was occasioned, not by what it said, but by what it had omitted. He certainly regretted that not a word had been said about the distress which, it must be admitted, prevailed to a great extent in the country; but he was glad that his Majesty had declared his intention of enforcing the strictest economy in all the departments of the State, as such a course would offer the best means of alleviating the distress. He would support the Address, because, though his Majesty's Speech declared that it was the King's intention to transmit the Constitution unimpaired to his successor, it did not denounce the adoption of salutary measures of reform.

Mr. *Denman* felt gratified at the speech which had been delivered by the right hon. Secretary opposite (Sir G. Murray). That speech, he was convinced, would be received with satisfaction throughout the country. He only regretted that, in another place, where a Minister of the Crown had thought it necessary to explain the ambiguous meaning of part of his Majesty's Speech, similar sentiments were not to be discovered. It was matter of deep regret, that in these times of alarm, while a right hon. Secretary in the House of Commons was expressing himself in favour of Reform, and not even restricting himself from approving of a measure for universal suffrage—(for he had declared his anxiety to discuss every plan of Reform, and his desire to know how the House of Commons could be reformed, so as to be made fit for the purposes of good government, the only principle on which any reform was proposed)—a noble person at the head of the Government, and who might be said to direct the destinies of Europe, had, within twenty-four hours, and within 100 yards of that spot, declared that no Reform should be listened to. Not only would the Government bring forward no plan of Reform as had been fondly expected, but no plan was to be listened to, and no amendment of the Constitution was to be suffered. The people were indebted to the right hon. Secretary for the sentiments which he had expressed, but they were more obliged to the noble person at the head of the Government for having fairly told them what they had to expect, and let them into the secret as to the principles on which the government of the country was to be conducted. It was with regret and disappointment he had heard every paragraph of his Majesty's Speech read from the Chair. There was not a single sentence in it worthy the approbation of an enlightened Administration or an independent Parliament. In the first place, Government told Parliament that it was not their intention to interfere in the concerns of other nations, when by that very Speech they did interfere. They said they came forward as mediators; but they declared that they had made up their minds that one of the parties was in the wrong; and, forsooth, that party had occasioned all the evils which afflicted Belgium and threatened the repose of Europe. He objected to the Government of this country volunteering an opinion on the subject. Who wanted to know what Ministers thought on the matter? The people of Belgium were, however, slandered by being designated revolted subjects. But the right hon. Secretary said, there was no reproach in the words, and observed, that the Low Countries were stated in history to have revolted against Philip. But supposing Queen Elizabeth, in addressing Parliament, had designated the people of the Low Countries as revolted subjects, and expressed her regret at their rising against their enlightened sovereign, he should like to know what the House of Commons of that time would have said? That was a parallel case. If we were to enter into the discussion of how foreign people and foreign governments had conducted themselves, why did the King's Speech limit itself to that meagre account of the Duke of Orleans becoming king of the French? Was it an enlightened government which had led to that change? Why, then, was not the enlightened government of Charles 10th referred to? And as to interference, if there ever was a time when our interference in French affairs would have been beneficial, it was the period between the dissolution of the first Chamber and the issue of the Ordinances,—interference then might have been usefully exercised. But in the case of France, the Speech was limited to a simple statement of the fact; and the hon. Seconder had told the House, that as the Duke of Orleans had been recognized by the king of England as King of the French, it followed as a corollary, on the same principle, that Don Miguel must be acknowledged as king of Portugal. It was delightful to contemplate the improvements of the age, and wonderful to see the progress of education in its effects upon the human mind, in the mode in which the French people had conducted themselves, affording an example to all the world, how a bad government ought to be resisted. Notwithstanding the provocations they had received, they had exercised a wonderful forbearance at a time when they could have done whatever they pleased. It had been justly asked, when had the victories of despotism been so conducted? When governments had succeeded in recovering what they deemed their just rights, they were said to exhibit a wonderful degree of moderation if they shed but little blood. But in France the triumphant party seemed to be endeavouring to save the lives of their greatest enemies, and, great as their guilt was, he trusted they would be saved by their own insignificance from the punishment they justly deserved. The people of France had done all they could, to preserve themselves, without unnecessary sacrifices. But in the case of Belgium he could not say so much. He could not say who was right and who was wrong. He did not know the state of the facts; but that made it the more improper for a House of Commons to echo back the charge of revolt; particularly in a case of so much importance, where a single word put into the mouth of our King might produce another expenditure of 1,200,000,000*l*. As to the epithet "enlightened," which had been applied to the government of the Netherlands, the Ministers who had prevailed upon his Majesty to adopt it, could have had no knowledge of the subject. But the people of England knew that the fundamental law of that kingdom had been violated,—that the liberty of the Press had been put down, and the Trial by Jury got rid of. As far as he could see of the Belgian insurrection, it did appear as if a sort of Paris fashion had spread abroad: for there had been no immediate cause for the revolt when it broke out. That circumstance, however, made the lesson the more serious to other countries. When some important event occurred to shake the pillars upon which the Constitution rested, all the real grievances of the people rose to the surface. When once they were in a state of excitement, a strain—a hurt—a weakness only would betray their real feelings. In our own case it would have been perfectly easy for Government to have conciliated the people of England by saying to them, "we know that you have grievances, and sufferings, and abuses; we will provide an effectual remedy, and to your unavoidable sufferings we are not indifferent." But, no; all was defiance—all was menace. "We will put down sedition," said his Majesty's Ministers; "at the same time we will give permission to any Members on the opposite side of the House to bring forward any project of Reform, with a reservation of the rights of those in another place to interfere in the election of Members of the House of Commons." But they would not put a word into the Speech respecting the redress of the people's grievances, in respect to that unconstitutional and intolerable abuse in the representation of the people, which made it stink in the nostrils of the country. The people mocked at it when they were told that they were represented in the Commons House of Parliament. The people expected that the King's Government itself would come forward with some measure: and if the Government would not do it, they looked to the House of Commons; and if the House would not do what it was their bounden duty to do, the people would look to it themselves. He did not say that they would feel a disposition to resort to illegal measures, but they would proceed by petition and remonstrance; and if that would not do, he did not say they would have recourse to any thing which savoured of violence; but if the country was to be loaded with the taxation of former years, and discontents arose, there were furnished, to those individuals who were intent on mischief and agitation, topics of frightful grievances, rendered still more alarming by the indication which had appeared elsewhere, of a determination to resist all attempts at redress; and a crisis was not unlikely to arrive, the consequences of which the youngest in that House might have reason to deplore. With regard to the Union, he felt the utmost dislike and repugnance to every motion for the repeal of a legislative, or any other union between the two countries of England and Ireland. If the hon. and learned member for Waterford had any grievances to allege—for which, however, the repeal of the Union was the last remedy—let them be brought forward, and let the House consider of the remedy. Let the Irish people state their grievances, and let the Government endeavour to redress them. As far as he knew the state of the case, we were placed in a situation entirely new. He well remembered, not many years ago, when a motion for Reform was brought forward, it had been resisted by a right hon. Gentleman, who asked, "What have you to gain by Reform?" Mr. Canning referred triumphantly to the individuals amongst the Ministers who represented popular places. But it was not so now. Let the members for Yorkshire and Middlesex come forward and tell them what was the state and feelings of the country. The hon. Member concluded by protesting, on behalf of the people of England, against the horrible idea that we were to tender our interference in the affairs of a foreign nation, after pronouncing in favour of its government. Ministers could not be in communication with the people, they could not know their sentiments, when they put such a proposition into the mouth of the King. If there had been any well considered amendment to the Address, recommending the improvement of the representation of the people, he would have supported it; and when the question of the Address came again before the House, he should feel it to be his duty to say that he never would support it.

Mr. *Trefusis* was inclined, after the King's Speech, and the declaration of the Ministers, to believe, that their conduct would not excite great animosity, and that there could be no fear of a revolution being attempted in this country. He was sorry, however, to learn, that his Majesty did not recommend Reform of the Parliament, as he thought that was necessary, at least so far as to give the right of sending Members to Parliament to the large unrepresented manufacturing towns.

Lord *F. L. Gower* felt great reluctance to address the House, after the speech of the well-dressed actor, the hon. and learned member for Nottingham, whom he was glad to see in the House again. He was not surprised at the objection which had been made to the King's Speech, by those from whom that objection was natural and proper, viz. that the subject of Parliamentary Reform had not been recommended to the House. He was bound to say, that he saw, as plain as any man, the tide which ran so strong in favour of that question in the country. He knew there had been a clamour raised throughout the land in its favour, and it was no wish or aspiration of his to take an unpopular view of a public question. Still he stood there to say, that, after full consideration, and some little experience, his opinions on that question remained unchanged. What were those opinions? he might be asked. He had formerly stated, that he thought the measure would be dangerous to the interests of the country. Some remarks had been made after the declaration which had been uttered in another place on this question. But when an occasion occurred to state that person's opinion, it was a manly and open course to say that that opinion remained unchanged; it might otherwise be insinuated, "You are lying by, and trimming your sails, till you see in what direction the wind blows." If the King's Speech had omitted the mention of Parliamentary Reform, so had every Speech from the Throne, as far as the memory of man runneth. He viewed the events of Paris with satisfaction, not unmingled with regret, for he lamented that the king was a bigot, and his minister a fanatic, while he could not but admire and applaud the gallantry with which the people had asserted their violated liberties.

Mr. *Sandford* denied the necessity for an armed interference between the king of the Netherlands and his subjects. He was sorry to hear the noble Lord opposite apply the term "clamour" to the expression of popular feeling on the subject of parliamentary reform. That, with other expressions used by official men that night, as well as some portions of their conduct, convinced him, that the Ministers were totally unacquainted with the feelings and sentiments of the people of England. The irresistible torrent of public opinion that was coming down amongst them he hoped would soon efface every vestige of that aristocratic prejudice which had dictated such language.

Mr. *H. Davis* refused to entertain any plan of parliamentary reform, as he conceived that every interest in the country was already sufficiently represented. He viewed the proposal with inexpressible dismay, and greatly feared it would be discovered, when too late, that the change demanded was very much miscalled by those who designated it reform. His constituency comprised a great number of votes, and he did not hesitate to say, that the question was one of the most dangerous ever mooted within the walls of Parliament. It appeared, however, that no twenty men of those who advocated "reform," could be found to agree in opinion as to what would be the best mode of attaining it.

Mr. *Hughes Hughes* expressed the warmest approbation of every sentiment contained in the Address, in which, therefore, from the beginning to the end, he most cordially concurred. He would give Ministers his unqualified confidence, and support them through evil report and good report, without any compromise of principles, or sacrifice of his independence. This determination he was the more anxious to take the present opportunity of avowing, as it had been bruited abroad that he had become a member of a factious and irreconcileable opposition. He had been sent to that House by the unbiassed votes of a free, a high-minded, and intelligent constituency, to whom, it was but justice to say, that their Representative never yet had been, and never would become, the bond-slave of a faction. In this awful and tremendous crisis—a crisis more extraordinary than any which the chronicles of the whole world could produce—it pleased Providence to elevate to the Throne a mild, amiable, and paternal Monarch, who had selected the existing Ministry at the very commencement of his reign, to guide the councils of the State. He should therefore give them his confidence, and he scrupled not to promise, that he would strengthen their hands. The time, he trusted, was now past, when their support of a useful measure would be regulated by their feelings towards the side of the House from whence it had proceeded.

Mr. *Trevor* gave his cordial support to the Address, and thought that the passage which had been objected to, relative to Belgium, was a very proper one.

Sir *R. Peel* said, that the discussion which had just taken place, imposed on him the duty of making one or two observations on the subject of parliamentary reform, respecting which the hon. and learned member for York had so recently given notice of a motion. This task he would rather, on the present occasion have avoided, as he was unwilling to express an opinion on such a question, until it should have been legitimately brought under the consideration of the House. A construction, however, had been put on the declarations of his right hon. friend, which deprived him of an alternative. With regard to the question generally, he might remark, that he had never hitherto taken a very decided part. Opposed to it he admitted he certainly had been, but at the same time (with very few exceptions), he had contented himself with a silent vote. It appeared that a passage in the speech of his right hon. friend had been interpreted as expressive of the sentiments of Government generally on the subject. Now he fully admitted that he saw difficulties about the question of reform which he was by no means prepared to solve. He wished, nevertheless, to say nothing then which might in any degree prejudice the discussion hereafter, or interfere with its advancement to a satisfactory termination. He saw considerable difficulties attendant on the mere agitation of the topic, and he confessed himself at a loss to conjecture the principle of limitation which the hon. and learned Member appeared to contemplate as the guarantee of a moderate reform. The member for Nottingham (Mr. Denman) had intimated, as he understood him, that no measure of reform which still allowed of the interference of Peers in the return of Members of the House of Commons would satisfy him. His argument, he concluded from the tenour of his speech, must be directed against an aristocratic government altogether. To such an extent he was not prepared to go; nor did he at present see any prospect that such a measure of safe, moderate reform, as his Majesty's Government might be inclined to sanction, would satisfy the demands or expectations of the reformers. This only he would now premise, reserving a fuller exposition of his sentiments to the opportunity when they could be regularly and seasonably explained. As to the interference with Belgium, he owned he was surprised to find such difference of opinion after the speech which they had heard from the noble Lord opposite last night. They had but one of three courses to pursue; either to disavow all interest in the affairs of Belgium, as the hon. member for Middlesex suggested, allowing French soldiers to make what incursions they pleased, and take possession of Antwerp and other fortifications unmolested; or, by military interference, to compel the submission of the provinces to their king, (neither of which we adopted); or lastly, when civil war was raging in a part of Europe, from its position peculiarly calculated to embroil neighbouring States, to mediate with a view to restore tranquillity, and not for the purpose of subjugating the Netherlands; and this was the species of interference to which the British Government had had recourse. The Speech from the Throne did not contain a word which necessarily implied the re-annexation of the provinces to the crown from which they had revolted. Did those expressions, at a time when civil war was devastating two of the finest cities on the Continent—did those expressions imply that the object of Government was quiet mediation? He contended that they did. What was the end to be answered by the interferences alluded to? Was it the subjugation of Belgium? No, in the words of the Speech it was, "to restore the tranquillity and the good government of the Netherlands." He denied that the expressions used implied another meaning. It yet remained open for the Government to take any steps that might appear most advantageous. Had this country, after Antwerp and Brussels had been completely ransacked and ruined—after the people in those cities had suffered grievously—this country had said, "We leave you to settle your matters as you best can," we should have thrown the Netherlands open to others, and that would have been the most probable way of ensuring the complete annihilation of their recently-acquired liberties. England had, as on all former occasions, acted on a different principle. The hon. and learned Gentleman, the member for Yorkshire, last night said, that this was the first instance of the mention in any King's Speech, of the internal disturbances of a foreign State, and he referred to the line of conduct adopted in the case of Poland. But there was not the slightest analogy between the two cases. The partition of Poland was not occasioned by internal hostility. It was the dismemberment of a country by foreign Powers; and what the partition of Poland had to do with the Netherlands he could not comprehend. The question, in that instance, was fully discussed, and it was determined that this country should not take part in it. But the hon. and learned Gentleman was not correct in stating that this was the first occasion on which the King's speech had mentioned matters of this nature. In contradiction of his assertion he would refer to the Speeches in 1787 and 1792; and then he was sure the hon. and learned Gentleman would hardly maintain his assertion. The first of those documents contained a reference to the state of France; and in addition, there was a reference made in the King's Speech, delivered in 1764, to Holland itself. The Speech delivered on the 30th of May, 1787, said—" But dissensions unhappily prevail among the States of the United Provinces, which, as a friend and well-wisher to the republic, I cannot see without the most real concern." Here was a distinct reference to the internal condition of a foreign State. In the same year, when the government of France evinced a disposition towards an invasion of the Netherlands, this country took steps which fully proved, that the policy of non-interference was dependent on the policy of other States. At the opening of the Session of Parliament, on the 27th of November, 1787, the King's Speech stated —" At the close of the last Session I informed you of the concern with which I observed the disputes unhappily subsisting in the republic of the United Provinces. Their situation soon afterwards became more critical and alarming, and the danger which threatened their constitution and independence, seemed likely, in its consequence, to affect the security and interests of my dominions." These facts shewed that the present Government had not struck out any new line of conduct. He did not mean then to argue the right of taking the step alluded to in his Majesty's Speech, but he contended that it was neither proper nor fair for the hon. and learned Gentleman to state, that this was the first time when such a step had been taken. The act might be wrong or right; he would not discuss that; he only meant to shew, that this was not the first instance in which his Majesty's Speech had expressed sentiments relative to the internal state of foreign countries, and the interference of this country with disturbances in them. The Speech from the Throne also stated—" In conformity to the principle which I had before explained, I did not hesitate, on receiving this notification, to declare, that I could not remain a quiet spectator of the armed interference of France, and I gave immediate orders for augmenting my forces both by sea and land." Had the hon. and learned Gentleman adverted to the conduct of Mr. Fox on that occasion he would have found that Mr. Fox said,—that he considered the course adopted was perfectly just, and he objected only to the use of the word "lawful" in the Address. There were other occasions when mention was made in the Speech from the Throne, of disturbances abroad. In 1790 the hon. and learned Gentleman might have found that a reference was made to the internal state of a foreign country, and the declaration on that occasion was as nearly as possible the same as that of the present Speech. In 1790, the King coming to Parliament, stated from the Throne "Since the last Session of Parliament a foundation has been laid for a pacification between Austria and the Porte, and I am now employing my mediation, in conjunction with my Allies, for the purpose of negociating a definitive treaty between those Powers, and of endeavouring to put an end to the dissensions in the Netherlands, in whose situation I am necessarily concerned, from considerations of national interest, as well as from the engagements of treaties." If other proofs were wanting to refute the assertion, that on no former occasion had reference been made in a King's Speech to the internal dissensions of a foreign country, it would only be necessary to refer to the year 1787. He was not asking whether the mention of the internal state of foreign countries was wrong; he only wished to show, that it would be foreign to the policy which England had pursued on former occasions, not to have done as had been done in the present instance. The hon. and learned Gentleman had referred to former occasions, and had taunted his Majesty's Government with their present proceedings, but he would contend that it was a matter of great importance to the condition of that country, and, in fact, to the whole continent of Europe, that his Majesty should express his opinion of the unhappy state of affairs in the Netherlands. As he had before stated, there were only three courses for this country to pursue. Indifference to the proceedings in the Netherlands would have given a notice to other countries that England abandoned them to their fate. To have used a military force, to compel a restoration of tranquillity in that country would not have been consistent with the policy of Mr. Pitt? He begged, to recall to the mind of the hon. and learned Gentleman, that part of the history of the proceedings of this country in which it was proposed by the late Mr. Pitt to give to the Russian Ambassador a written statement, as conclusive of his opinion, as to what ought to be done in the year 1805. In that document Mr. Pitt separated the case of those countries with respect to which, owing to their situation, the interference of this country would be just and proper, from those other countries, which, being only remotely connected with Great Britain, interference could seldom or never be justified, and Mr. Pitt included the Netherlands under the former division. That opinion was given by him a short time only before his death. Thus, he had, as he thought, satisfactorily proved two cases in which the King's Speech had mentioned the state of the Netherlands, notwithstanding the assertion of the hon. and learned Gentleman to the contrary. But it was said, what right had the Government to characterize the Belgians as revolted subjects. Had we not, it was said, passed a warm eulogium on the revolution of the French? We had, but he contended that the condition of the two countries was totally different. With respect to Belgium, the political condition of that country was settled by the Congress assembled at Vienna. The arrangement was laid before Parliament, and in all the discussions in 1815, but few objections were made to it. There was a distinct motion made with respect to Genoa, but not with respect to the Netherlands. The result of the arrangements made by the Congress at Vienna was, that Belgium was intrusted to the sovereignty of the king of Holland, under certain restrictions or fundamental laws, which were imposed on the king of Holland for the exclusive benefit of the Belgians themselves. Some of the conditions were—that no innovation should be made in the articles of the Constitution—that the fundamental law should remain inviolate—that free access to the Throne should be allowed to the citizens, in order that they might lay their grievances before his Majesty—and that no impediment should be offered to the Belgian subjects for the benefit of the Dutch. In fact, all these Articles were intended for the advantage of the Belgians, and the king of Holland took that people with the understanding that a violation of them by him would authorize the Belgians to apply to the Allied Powers, the parties to the treaty, for redress; thereby reducing the question for the consideration of his Majesty's Government to the simple fact—did or did not the king of Holland violate the fundamental laws on which rested his sovereignty over Belgium? He contended for one, that the king of Holland had not violated those laws, but that, on the contrary, he had always manifested the greatest readiness to submit the redress of any grievances of which his Belgian subjects might complain, to the proper constitutional authority—the States General. In his opinion the king of the Netherlands intended to do right, and the conduct of that monarch had not been contrary to the laws laid down by the Congress. The hon. and learned member for Nottingham in stating his reasons for not agreeing with that part of the Address which alluded to the disturbances in the Netherlands, passed the severest condemnation on the conduct of the Belgians he had yet heard. That hon. and learned Member said, that the Belgians had imitated in their conduct, the last Paris fashion. Could there be a stronger term used in speaking of a civil war, than to describe it as merely imitating a fashion? There was neither prudence nor justice in confounding the events which gave rise to the occurrences in France, with those of Belgium. Not only was there no similarity between the circumstances of the two cases, but there was a ready disposition on the part of the king of the Netherlands to submit the grievances of the people to the proper tribunal, to the States General, for consideration. In the Address of the king of the Netherlands to the States General, his Majesty said, "I am disposed to comply with reasonable desires." Again, in the message he afterwards sent down to that assembly, he leaves these two questions for their consideration—whether experience had shown the necessity of revising the fundamental law? Whether, in that case, the system established by treaty and by the fundamental laws between the two great divisions of the kingdom, for the promotion of their common interests require to be altered in their form or nature? These were the terms which that sovereign used when he left the subject for the consideration of the States General. The hon. and learned Gentleman said last night that the march of Prince Frederick to Brussels was a violation of the Belgian compact. But he believed that Prince Frederick's march to Brussels was not a preconcerted act. His advance on that town was not made with any intention of bringing the military force under him into action. For, what were the facts? At first, the insurrection in Brussels did not appear to have any definite object; and Prince Frederick's march to that town was equally without any decided purpose of committing violence. Brussels had just before been the scene of an undefined commotion, the objects of which were, the removal of an unpopular minister, and of a municipal tax. To check the excesses of the agents in this insurrection, the inhabitants organized themselves into a burgher guard, which most probably would have succeeded but for the foreigners and unemployed poor in the neighbourhood, who flocked into the town, and ultimately enabled the insurgents to defeat the burgher guard. Prince Frederick had no other object than to support this guard in protecting property, and was astonished when he met with the resistance which was offered to his entry. The charge of treachery, made against him was without any foundation. The real question before the House was, whether it would come to a resolution to vote, in answer to the Speech of his Majesty, the Address before it. Without going further, at present, into a consideration of these questions, he would merely observe that the Address did not pledge the House to adopt the course recommended by Government; and that the hon. member for Westminster (Mr. Hobhouse) entertained that view of it was evident, from his having given a notice of a distinct motion on the subject that day. He disclaimed all idea of interference by force of arms; but he was satisfied that the interference his Majesty's Ministers contemplated was more likely to contribute to the attainment of a peaceful issue than if they were to follow the advice of some of the hon. Members opposite, and maintain a contemptuous indifference towards the present condition of Belgium. He begged it to be understood that such interference by no means contemplated the restoration of arrangements as they stood before; the word Netherlands having been introduced into the Speech for the express purpose of leaving the whole question open to the consideration of the representatives of the Allied Powers.

Mr. *Brougham* regretted, that at such a late hour of the night, he should have occasion to rise; for, it was with the greatest reluctance he felt himself again bound to trespass on the House in its then exhausted state, but he would promise to detain it for a very short time only, harassed as it had been by the discussions of last night as well as of this. He wished to say a few words, and no more, but at the same time he begged to assure the House that he meant to say as much as he liked, and that no expression of disapprobation should induce him to abridge his address by one-twentieth part of a minute. His object was to leave that company to go home, for the purpose of going to sleep, but he could not carry that object into effect until it suited his convenience. He wished to shew that it was not his fault, nor that of his friends, that he was bound to detain the House; but that it arose from the peculiar circumstances in which the Ministers had put themselves, by the right hon. Baronet getting up that evening to answer some observations which he had made last night, that compelled him to have recourse to a second speech. His speech could have been answered last night had it been deemed worthy of a reply. There was sufficient time for such a purpose, notwithstanding it was about half-past eleven, or it might be a little later, when it was delivered. The arguments used were last night considered by the Government too insignificant to be noticed, and yet there were three of the Cabinet Ministers in their seats. First, there was the Master of the Mint, or President of the Woods and Forests, he knew not which; next there was a Member of great dignity in the Cabinet,—the right hon. Secretary for the Colonies—and, lastly, there was the right hon. Gentleman who held the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, which had always been esteemed an office of importance. And yet, those three worthy individuals, those right hon. Gentlemen, those important official personages, those great Cabinet officers, held the propositions last night made in their presence at so low a rate, as not to consider them worthy of a single word in reply. To night the matter was completely changed; down came the right hon. Gentleman, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, another member of the Cabinet, and attempted to give that night an answer to the arguments used last night. It was not for him to question the line of conduct drawn by the members of the Cabinet to act on; with that he had nothing to do; but he did feel surprised that the opinions he expressed last night, which then seemed of so insignificant a nature as not to be deserving of an answer,—there was nothing in them, mere words, void of substance, and he was left in a sort of plenary security until to-night, none of those three right hon. Gentlemen choosing to tender himself in order to controvert any position, however fallacious, he had advanced; he did feel surprised, though he did not question the conduct of Ministers, that they should this night have deemed opinions worthy of an elaborate refutation, to which they last night disdained to give any reply. Those three right hon. Gentlemen had then drawn themselves up in line; they were ready to charge, but never was there a war more completely in disguise. Silence was then the order of the day, but after the whole body had been occupied in twenty-four hours deliberation, it was determined, that the speech made last night was something—was not thin air—and was deserving of an answer. This decision having been come to, papers were referred to, memorandums examined from time immemorial; in fact, all the books and papers of the Foreign Office seemed to have been literally ransacked for the purpose of enabling the right hon. Secretary to attempt that answer which the House had just heard. Notwithstanding the right hon. Gentleman had taken all that immense trouble, and availed himself of all the assistance he could get out of the House, for it was plain enough that he could not expect any within the House, he must contend, that his arguments with respect to Belgium remained untouched; and not all the ministerial lucubrations during the twenty-four hours which had elapsed, had enabled the right hon. Gentleman to explain away his positions. He willingly passed over the case of Poland, because, if the House would have the goodness to recollect, that argument was only urged in the same view as that taken by the right hon. Secretary; for what he said was, that even where there might have been deemed cause for interference, where Russia, where Prussia, where Austria, were interfering, yet that so rooted was the policy of this country, so fixed was the resolution of the Statesmen of those days, to avoid all interference, that they abstained from making the slightest reference in the King's Speech to the partition of Poland. If he were to give an opinion, it would be, following that of Burke, distinguished by his profound and enlightened sagacity on all matters, whether regarding our domestic interests or our foreign relations, and following also, he believed, the authority of Mr. Fox; if he were to give an opinion, he would say, that Ministers pushed the principle of non-interference, on that occasion, to the very extreme; for there was matter calling for interference, and if they did not interfere, the only possible justification they could have, consisted in the peculiarities of their situation, the unwillingness of France to back them, and the unhappy affair which loaded and overloaded their own hands, the colonies of North America then beginning to be discontented. But as to France, be it observed, that all the lucubrations of the right hon. Baronet and his colleagues had not enabled them to discover one single tittle, in any one King's speech, subsequent to the bursting forth of the French Revolution, in which that country was alluded to. The disturbances, and almost dethronement of the King in 1789; his virtual dethronement in 1790; his actual dethronement in 1791, were all passed over, without the King, in his Speeches to Parliament, making a single comment upon them. It was not until the issuing the Ordinance of the 20th of November, 1792, which, in fact, amounted to a declaration of war against other countries, as it called upon their subjects to revolt; it was not till then, notwithstanding all the previous events were of such stirring importance; it was not until that Ordinance was issued, that any allusion was made to French affairs in any speech from the Throne. But, said the right hon. Baronet, look to the speeches addressed by his Majesty to Parliament in 1787! And that was said in answer to my proposition, that no reference was ever made to the affairs of a foreign state in a King's speech until that of last night. Candid and fair as the right hon. Baronet generally was, he had here made a slight departure from his usual candour and fairness, in holding fast to the very strict letter of that proposition. In saying that there had been no reference to any mention of foreign parts, or the internal state of any foreign country in any by-gone King's Speech, was it not evident to every man who heard his (Mr. Brougham's) statement, that what he was grappling with was, the kind of reference, bestowing praise on one party, and blame and censure on another; and his complaint was, that the King in his Speech took a part—that we were no longer neutral—for that was his charge; that we could not act by mediation between the two parties, because we had pronounced a sentence of disqualification against ourselves, such as would prevent the Belgians, or any man in his senses, from taking the Government as an arbitrator. He said, then, again, that that had been done now which had not been done before, he had shewn it; he had admitted that the right hon. Secretary was correct in his quotation; he had attended to the words he quoted from the King's Speech in 1787, but what were they? "The King views with regret the dissensions of the Low Countries;" and on the second occasion he rejoiced that those dissensions were at an end. If his present Majesty had been advised by his Ministers to express his regret that there had been troubles in the Netherlands, and that they were not yet appeased, he should never have taken the trouble to express any regret that so feeble, so inefficient, so innoxious an allusion to those troubles had been made; but the King's Speech at present said of one party, that he was an enlightened Prince, and of the other, that they were unjust, wrong-doers, and revolters: it gave the balance in favour of one, and made the interest and justice, if justice there should happen to be, of the cause of the other kick the beam. His objection was not to the reference, but that in a spirit of partiality, all was given to one side, and all against the other. He was not sure that the precedent of 1787 was one which ought to be followed, but at any rate it was a precedent founded on a treaty, and if, in the present instance, we had been bound by treaty, he should not have objected in the manner he had done, or, if he had objected, he should on the same principle, have opposed, instead of approving of all that took place with regard to Portugal in 1827 and 1828. In the year 1787, when we were bound by treaty, and in the year 1790, when we were also bound by treaty, and when, according to the exigency of those treaties, a certain something took place, it was a matter of course that the Crown should take notice of it in its Address to Parliament. But in those instances, however, the question was not as to the internal affairs of the foreign country, but as to its external relations; in which case, according to all precedent and right—whether according to good policy was another matter—we assumed to interfere. No one instance, therefore, quoted by the right hon. Baronet was in point, in the present case, as matter of precedent; for all the instances he had given were of interference, either by Treaty, or where, by armament, or by alliance offensive, or even actual hostility, danger was apprehended, or the distribution of territory talked about; all which were matters relating to the foreign, and not to the internal domestic arrangements of a country. He wished not to be misunderstood, and he would be the more particular in endeavouring to guard himself against being misunderstood, as he was liable to the risk of two kinds of misrepresentations from opposite quarters. He was liable, in the first place, to be told by the right hon. Secretary—or rather, as he told the hon. member for Middlesex—that the Member of a British Parliament, for the first time, desired that England should remain indifferent to the Netherlands. Neither he nor his hon. friend said, that we were to be totally indifferent to the balance of power on the Continent, when there was a chance of one country becoming so powerful as to endanger the national safety. But if there be no such chance, the Government had no pretext, no right to interfere; and without such right it was the grossest impolicy to endanger the peace of this country by intermeddling with the internal policy of other States. But did not the King's Speech interfere with the internal policy of a foreign State? And when the right hon. Baronet pleased himself with building castles in Spain, or rather in Holland, one of the provinces of Spain before the time of Phillip 2nd, he gave the strongest possible confirmation of all the arguments urged against him, and the strongest grounds for an increase of alarm. He said, the king of England was to take measures, with his allies, to quiet those internal disturbances. What would have been done, he wished to ask, in the time of Mr. Pitt? It might have been said, that theKing intended to take measures to prevent the encroachments of France, or to prevent the Netherlands from becoming united to France. That was all intelligible enough; that related to foreign affairs, but it was not the point of which he complained, for that was a matter in which we had a right to interfere if we deemed it good policy, concerning which he should presently say a word. But what did the Administration—or rather the Duke at the head of the Administration, for it was he, probably that managed all matters, external as well as internal—though, by the way, if Ministers would interfere as little with foreign affairs as they did with our domestic concerns,—always excepting the right hon. Secretary opposite,—it would be well for the country; but what, he was asking, did the Duke and his Administration say? what was the castle of mediation they were building? "Oh!" they said, "we interfere to restore the tranquillity of the Low Countries, not to preserve the balance of power—not to maintain national independence, but just to have a little something to do with the internal arrangements of those countries, taking care that they be consistent with their welfare and good government." What did that mean? Did not that kind of interference, that kind of settlement, bear along with it the ideas of taxes, of religious liberty, of the Trial by Jury, of the freedom of the Press, of *habeas corpus*? Did it not mean everything which we considered as necessary to the domestic welfare and good government of a people? He called upon the right hon. Baronet, and those who had looked for precedents with him—which he had not had time to look at, to think of, or even to dream about, not fancying he should be called upon to reply to an answer to a speech made last night—again he called upon Ministers, and he gave them until the 12th, when the motion of the hon. member for Westminster was to come on, to answer the call, and to bring forward any authority, in times worthy of being mentioned as an example, where the internal welfare of a country, the happiness or misery of the people of a foreign province, had been alluded to as matter of negotiation by the King in his Speech from the Throne. The right hon. Secretary had brought forward Mr. Pitt's paper of 1805; and it was only the great pressure of his case, and the want of argument to support it, that could have induced him to bring forward a document so little to the purpose. His reply to it was twofold, and either of them fatal to its production as an argument in this case. In the first place, it was written when a war was raging, which had been raging for nearly twenty years. To say that any observations of Mr. Pitt's, made at such a time, in a private document, not in a King's Speech committing the country—to dream that such was a parallel case to starting forward in the bosom of tranquillity, and interfering in politics purely domestic, was one of the most extraordinary hallucinations that he ever knew a distressed reasoner fall into. But he had a second answer to this reference to the paper of

1805. He listened to it with the double respect which he entertained for the Gentleman who cited it, and for him whose name it bore; but thus listening to it,—thus attending to every syllable, from the beginning to the end, he could not discover, even in that private communication from an individual to the minister of a foreign government,—for it must still be recollected, that it was not a public document, that it was not an opinion flaming in a Speech from the Throne, on the occasion of a new King meeting a new Parliament; he could not discover, in that paper, one single syllable that applied to any thing but the independence of this country, the conquest of that, the partition of another, &c., all of which related to their external foreign relations, and were, consequently the legitimate object of interference. There was not in the whole of that document one tittle of reference to the internal Administration of the States mentioned in it. He was exposed, as he had said, to misrepresentation in two quarters. It might be thought, if he did not guard himself against the supposition, that he had expressed opinions too favourable to interference in cases of external relations, such as those connected with the balance of power. Suppose France, in an evil hour—not that he had any apprehension of the kind—should think of going towards the Rhine, or that some other distribution of the States of Europe should be imagined in the brain of some continental statesman, it might be thought he was bound by this statement at once to say—interference is called for. Now, the question of interference was one of a twofold character: it was partly a question of strict right, but was much more a question of policy. We might have the right to interfere when it would be politic also, and when expediency and right combined, interference might be a duty, but we might have the right at the time when interference would not only be impolitic, but destructive to this country; and he warned whoever might be the Minister of this country against interfering by hostility, by armament, by expenditure, by anything beyond mediation or treaty, even in a case within the legitimate province of interference; he meant where the subject did not relate to matters of internal Government, but to external relations. The people of this country, be assured, would not bear to go to war for a foreign nation. The strongest expression which he had heard on this subject during the last eventful six months proceeded from an honourable colleague of his. He trusted he rightly understood him—a friend and supporter of the present Administration, the only one of his colleagues who belonged to that description and party, as well as the only person of mark or weight, who, during the last four or five months, he had found to answer that description out of that House. He had talked of mediation; now he held it to be, on the face of the King's Speech, one of the grossest and most crying absurdities that ever dropped from the lips of man, to expect, as some Gentlemen had done—he alluded to some Gentlemen whose talk was not of oxen or of pigs—who seemed to think that mediation was all that was intended, and all that would take place; mediation was a soft, smooth, and apparently innocent expression, but it meant meddling, which leads to more meddling; and those who were ready to mediate might oftentimes find themselves obliged to fight, or, if not to fight, to spend money; and spending money meant supplies, and supplies meant taxes. But mediation, gracious Heaven! what chance had the Ministers to be mediators? They mediators! Who was to choose them? No doubt they were the mediators chosen by the enlightened king of the Netherlands, and would also be chosen by Polignac and the ex-King, Charles 10th; for their silence as to the affairs of Paris looked as if the French tyrants would not have had cause to dread them; but to be mediators the Ministers must be chosen by both parties. Who was the other party? Why, the revolters, the party whom the Government had condemned. The case was exactly that stated by the hon. member for Waterford; the Government had decided for the plaintiff before hearing the cause, and then expected the defendant to choose it as his arbitrator. With respect to the recognition of Don Miguel as King of Portugal he had no objection to it, for it flowed from his principle of non-interference. It was upon the same principle that we had recognized the government of France in 1792, however much we disapproved of the atrocities there committed; and upon the same principle of non-interference, the internal government of a country being no concern of strangers, we recognized the government of Algiers, of Tripoli, and of Tunis, receiving Ambassadors from one and sending Consuls to the others. All that he objected to, in the recognition of Miguel, was the time at which it was made, which he could not help thinking rather awkward. It was strange that it was never thought of during the past year, or mentioned in the last Speech from the Throne, whilst now we acknowledge Louis Philippe and Don Miguel together, in order to show that we thought one just as good a King as the other. He heartily wished, therefore, that the recognition of Don Miguel had taken place at any other time than the present. Having thus endeavoured to reply to the observations made in answer to a speech delivered some twenty-four hours ago, he would turn his attention to the more recent discussion before the House. Something had been said about the Question of Parliamentary Reform, and for his own part he begged to express his gratitude and delight at the manly, candid, and statesmanlike acknowledgment of his principles made by the right hon. the Secretary for the Colonial Department; and it gave him the greatest satisfaction, after the alarm and uneasiness he had experienced at the peremptory avowal of others in another place. Nothing said by the right hon. Secretary seemed to exclude anything in the way of Reform, except what was called universal suffrage. He was not disposed, however, to catch at a word, and would suppose that he went only a little way in the journey upon which he should wish the right hon. Secretary to accompany him. He would assume that he only went one or two steps, but at all events he differed entirely, diametrically, from those, whoever they might be, who had said, in whatever place, or on whatever occasion, that they, on due deliberation, and after mature reflection, were abundantly and entirely satisfied with the present constitution of Parliament, and that no change whatever had been proposed, and none which they could conceive to be proposed, could, in their opinion, mend that constitution. The opinion of the right hon. Secretary was the opposite of that, for he wished to see the constitution mended, and admitted that of amendment it was susceptible; desiring, however, to see it amended, for the only purpose which he, or any man, wished to see it amended, namely, the securing in a greater degree the comfort and welfare of the people, by means of a good Government. On these grounds, then, and they were fundamental, there was an entire and perfect agreement; and this agreement consoled him for the anathema pronounced against all Reform by a noble Lord, who yet regarded the events of Paris as truly glorious, the conduct of the late government there as utterly unjustifiable, and their subversion of all law, as justifying the acts of the people, whose conduct had covered them with glory. He agreed, then, with the one Minister, in wishing for the improvement of the Constitution of Parliament, and with another, in detesting the tyranny of those who would have brought France under a despotism; who were glad to try it, but who shrunk from the danger of the conflict; who cared little for the Constitution of their country, but much for the safety of their own persons: who valued much their own lives, but cared not for thousands of those of their unoffending countrymen; and he cordially joined with him in praise, gratitude, and admiration, as a man, and as an Englishman, of the conduct by which those atrocities were successfully repelled. How these Ministers could agree with each other it was not his business to inquire; they would have to-morrow morning, or some other time, to settle that among themselves. There was a point appertaining to this subject, on which he was desirous of explaining his sentiments. Some men seemed to deem it a consequence of our detestation of the late French rulers and admiration of the people, that we should covet a repetition of some such scenes at home. With these men he differed *toto cælo;* the cases were not the same, they were diametrically opposite, and therefore the example of France was not applicable to this country. He was for the reform of abuses, for the amendment of the Constitution of the realm, but he was for preserving, not pulling down; for restoring, and not for committing revolution; and he affirmed, that he must be a shallow politician, a miserable reasoner, and not only no very considerate, but no very trustworthy man, who argued that, because the people of Paris lawfully, and gloriously, resisted unjustifiable oppression, therefore the people of London, or of Dublin, ought to rise for Reform. Friend as he was to the removal of abuses, devoted as he was to Parliamentary Reform, he did not consider the refusal of this good—nay, he would even say, of these rights in the present circumstances of England, he meant the lawful refusal, by King, Lords, and Commons, as any ground of resistance to their authority. He hoped, that they would not be refused; but should they be refused, he should not consider that refusal as making ours in the slightest degree a parallel case to that of the French people. Of the justice of the proceedings at Brussels he would not speak; the government might be right, or the Belgians might be right, but whatever doubt he might have upon that subject, he had none whatever on that of France.

Sir *R. Peel* said, he was desirous of saying a few words with reference to what had fallen from the hon. and learned Gentleman respecting the recognition of Don Miguel; because he was as anxious as the hon. and learned Gentleman that a good understanding should subsist between this country and France. In the last Speech from the Throne, which was delivered on the 4th of February, 1830, an allusion was made to the probability of the recognition of Don Miguel. His Majesty saw, that numerous embarrassments in our relations made that desirable. It was unnecessary to state that at that time no events had occurred in France which rendered the recognition of Louis Phillipe necessary. The latter had been immediately recognized—the recognition of the former had not yet taken place; it must be evident therefore to all, that the two events were not connected.

Mr. *Brougham* expressed himself perfectly satisfied with the explanation which had been given by the right hon. Secretary.

Lord *Palmerston* wished to know, whether, in the event of Don Miguel granting the amnesty, it was the intention of the British Government to interfere to compel him to execute it if he should be disposed not to do so. Unless there should be some guarantee for the execution of the amnesty, individuals would not venture to place themselves within Don Miguel's power.

Sir *R. Peel* said, he could best answer the question by stating the circumstances connected with the proposed amnesty. We had done all in our power, by advice and friendly interference, to consult the interests of those who were denounced by the present government of Portugal. The language we held was, that we did not require the issuing of that amnesty, as the condition of our recognition of the Portuguese government, but we declared, that unless it should be published to the world, the recognition would not take place. We did not promise that the recognition would take place if the amnesty should be offered, but we stated that the withholding of the amnesty would prevent that recognition. He did not think it would be prudent in him to state what steps this Government might be called upon to take, in the event of a particular case arising. He would, however, state that we were not guarantees for the fulfilment of the amnesty.

The report brought up. Mr. Tennyson's Amendment was negatived without a division.

Mr. *Hume* moved, that the two following paragraphs should be added to the Address.

"To assure his Majesty that, whilst this House has heard with great satisfaction, his Majesty's determination to enforce economy in every branch of the public expenditure, they regret that his Majesty has not, with the view of giving relief to his loyal people, suffering severe privations by the heavy load of taxation, and by the existence of monopolies on the necessaries of life, stated whether it is his intention to recommend the reduction of any portion of the existing taxation, and of what particular taxes; and also what monopolies are to be abated; and, on behalf of the people, to remonstrate with his Majesty against the continuance of the present large establishments, and the heavy and impolitic taxation that exists, most earnestly recommend his Majesty's gracious attention to these subjects.

"To express their deep regret, that his Majesty should not have been advised to attend to the almost universal call of the nation for a Reform in the Commons House of Parliament, which does not at present represent the wishes or the wants of the people, and consequently, does not enjoy the confidence of the people, which it ought to possess, to secure the peace of the country. To represent most earnestly to his Majesty, that Reform in Parliament is the first and most important subject for his Majesty's deliberation; and that it is important for this House to take it into consideration without delay, on the recommendation of his Majesty, and with the support of his Majesty's Ministers." The hon. Gentleman prefaced his Motion by complaining that no allusion to the Corn-laws or the East-India monopoly had been made in the King's Speech, and stated, that due vengeance would be taken on Ministers for those omissions.

Sir *R. Peel* rose, and protested against the use of such language as that which had fallen from the lips of the hon. Gentleman. He was convinced it would be rejected and repudiated by every man of honour or property in the country: and that it would not even meet the approbation of the lower orders, for whom it was meant.

Mr. *Hume* said, he only meant that Ministers would lose their places for not attending to the wishes of the people.

Sir *R. Peel.*—Surely the hon. Member does not call that vengeance.

Mr. *Hume.*—That is what I meant.

The proposed additions were negatived without a division, and the report of the Address agreed to.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, Nov. 4.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. Praying for the abolition of Slavery, by Earl TALBOT, from Dissenters in the North Riding of Yorkshire:—By Lord SOMERS, from the Mayor and Freemen of Hereford, and from a Dissenting Congregation of the Town of Huntingdon:—By the Earl of HARDWICKE, from the Inhabitants of Wisbeach:—By Earl CAWDOR, from Protestant Dissenters at Haverfordwest:—By the Earl of RADNOR, from Protestant Dissenters at New Sarum and Downton:—By his Royal Highness the Duke of GLOUCESTER, from Truro, and another place in Cornwall:—By Earl GREY, from the Inhabitants of Bishop Auckland, from a Congregation of Baptists at the same place, and from Methodists at North Shields, at Alnwick, and Kimpton:—By Lord KING, from Protestant Dissenters at Ashburton:—By the Bishop of BATH and WELLS, from the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Wells, and from the Inhabitants of Bath, from the Inhabitants of Frome, and from Protestant Dissenters at Frome. Praying for the abolition of the Game Laws, by the Earl of RADNOR, from James Hamerton, of Hellifield Park, Yorkshire.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted their Lordships that his Majesty had returned the following Answer to their Address, which his Lordship read.

"My Lords, I have received with great satisfaction your dutiful and affectionate Address. I rely with entire confidence on your loyal attachment to my person and government, and on your zealous co-operation and cordial support in every measure calculated to promote the welfare of my subjects, and to maintain the honour and dignity of my Crown."

[The Earl of Winchilsea gave notice, that he should lay a Bill on their Lordships' Table to provide for the support and maintenance of agricultural labourers, by enabling the Justices of the Peace to make assessments on the land to employ such as were not employed, and to give relief to those landowners who employed the labourers.]

DECLARATION AGAINST MINISTERS.] The Earl of *Winchilsea* after giving the above notice, went on to say, that being on his legs, he would take that opportunity of expressing the heartfelt gratification which he felt, and he was sure that he expressed the feelings of the great body of the community, at the honest, the eloquent appeal which had been made to the House the other evening, by a noble Earl, whom he did not then see in his place. (Earl Grey.) He sincerely hoped that the course of policy which that noble Earl laid down, both as to our foreign and domestic concerns, would meet the approbation of his Majesty's Government, and that it would have the good sense to adhere to the great principle of non-interference. An open, direct, and honest policy was most suitable to the honour of this country, most consistent with its interests, and most consistent with its character as the birthplace of liberty. In all that the noble Earl had said of our foreign policy, he cordially agreed. As to our domestic policy he must observe, that it was not by arming one part of the population against the other, that we could now ward off the danger which threatened us, or that the security of property and of the institutions of the country, could be maintained. If the people had grievances, and God knew they had — and if these grievances were not redressed, there would be no security for property, and their Lordships would live to see our excellent institutions overturned. The best and only security was to be found in doing ample justice to the people, and in relieving their distress, and for this purpose, an inquiry should be instituted into the condition of the great body of the agricultural labourers, who were loyal and faithful, but suffering very greatly. He could not restrain his astonishment at hearing the declaration made by the noble Duke the other evening, relating to Parliamentary Reform. The noble Duke thought our present legislature so perfect, that he stated—"that if he had to form a legislature, he would create one, not equal in excellence to the present, for that he could not expect, but something as nearly of the same description as possible. He could give nothing more perfect, more capable of satisfying the empire, than the present Parliament." That was not his opinion. Moderate reform ought to take place, such as had been described by the noble Earl the other evening, with whose eloquently expressed sentiments he, most cordially agreed. If reform, moderate reform, did not take place, he could assure the noble Duke, that he would himself speedily witness the destruction of the best institutions of the country. He agreed fully with the sentiments of the noble Earl as to the degree of reform; he did not agree in the opinion that every man had a right to vote for Members of Parliament; he did not assent to the principle of universal suffrage, for the right of the people was, to have a good government, and that was the best government, which secured the interests, and gave the most satisfaction to the enlightened body of the people. There was no individual so well qualified to carry that reform into effect, as the noble Earl, and he hoped that a very short time would elapse, before the noble Earl brought forward some measure on the subject; and whenever it was brought forward he would give it his most cordial support. He was sure that the noble Earl would not bring forward any measure which was not consistent with the soundest policy, and not deserving general support. The present times were of no ordinary character. We were surrounded with dangers, and their Lordships would be blind to what they owed to themselves — blind to that situation of great trust in which they were placed, and they would neglect the duties they owed to their country, the confidence of which in the wisdom of Parliament had been much shaken, if they did not take some measures to win back the respect and confidence of the people. He firmly believed, that if ever their Lordships should become blind to the trust reposed by the Constitution in them, the Constitution would not survive. They must do justice to the people, and then they would have the people ready to support and maintain those laws which were necessary to the security and prosperity of all. He regretted very much that the King's Speech had not alluded to the great pressure under which the peasantry of the country and the agricultural interest laboured; and he regretted that his Majesty had not recommended the House to take that interest into its consideration. He was going to return to that county with which he was connected, where he hoped that he should diligently discharge his duties, and he trusted that some noble Lord, or the noble Duke who brought forward a Motion on this subject last Session, would bring the condition of the agricultural interest under the notice of the House. An inquiry ought to be instituted into the situation of the labouring classes, that their Lordships might give them effectual and speedy relief. If that passage of the noble Duke's speech which related to parliamentary reform had been framed with a view of conciliating and gaining the support of the high-minded noblemen with whom he (the Earl of Winchilsea) was usually united, he could tell the noble Duke, that he might as well attempt to take high heaven by storm. The country was in such a situation, that it required the most efficient men in the Administration. The present Ministers were not in possession of the confidence of the country, and other individuals placed in their stations must rescue the country from danger. He firmly believed, that all the Protestant part of the community had no confidence in the present Administration, and could only place confidence in such men as the noble Duke (Richmond, we believe) and the noble Earl (Grey, we believe,) who had always acted consistently, and had never betrayed their principles and the confidence of other men, in a manner unparalleled in the history of the country. Such men possessed and deserved the confidence of the great body of the country. He implored their Lordships to consider the situation of the country, and place before his Majesty in strong but respectful terms, their want of confidence in his Majesty's advisers, and point out to his Majesty the necessity of placing the Government in the hands of men of more political honesty and integrity than the present Ministers, and more capable of discharging the duties of Ministers of the Crown. Such was their unpopularity, that he believed, were it not for the influence of their office, they could not find in the new Parliament, fifty votes to support their Administration. For the peace and safety of the country, he hoped ere long. to see another set of men in their places, for they could not hold office, without endangering all the institutions of the country.

The Duke of *Wellington* complained of the noble Earl bringing forward such a series of remarks without any notice. It was not usual to make such attacks and such speeches without some intimation; neither was it usual for their Lordships to refer to what had been said in former debates. At least, too, if that were the case, what was referred to, ought to be stated accurately. The noble Earl had not represented correctly what had fallen from him. Such practices were not consistent with the usages of their Lordships' House, and he thought it would be much better if the noble Earl had adhered to the usual course of proceeding.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* had not, he believed, stated anything that the noble Duke had not said; at least he had no wish to misrepresent anything; that was not his intention, and it would only have been fair in the noble Duke had he stated in what manner he had misrepresented him. The noble Earl then moved, that their Lordships be summoned for Thursday next, when he should introduce the bill of which he had given notice.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, Nov. 4.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. Against Undue Returns, for the County of Tipperary, for the County of Limerick, for the City of Dublin, for the Boroughs of Wexford, Carlow, and Boroughbridge, and from Armagh. For the abolition of Negro Slavery, by Mr. BENETT, from Telshead:—By Mr. J. WOOD, from Kendal:—By Mr. DENMAN, from Portsea:—By Mr. RUMBOLD, from Yarmouth:—By Mr. BENETT, from four places in Wiltshire:—By Mr. LITTLETON, from Stone, Newcastle-under-Lyne, Lichfield, Betley, and Leek:—By Sir J. ASTLEY, from Warminster:—By Mr. C. PELHAM, from Great Driffield:—By Mr. SHAW, from a Congregation in Molesworth-street, Dublin:—By Mr. GUNNING, from Hackleton, Northamptonshire:—By Lord EASTNOR, from the City of Hereford:—By Mr. J. SMITH, from Chichester:—By Sir J. NEWPORT, from Waterford:—By Mr. DUNCOMBE, from fourteen places in Yorkshire:—By Lord MORPETH, from three other Parishes in Yorkshire:—By Mr. WILKS, from Brampton, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, and several places in Essex and Wilts:—By Mr. V. STUART, from the Inhabitants of Banbury:—By Mr. NEELD, from Chippenham:—By Mr. CURTEIS, from Helsham:—By Lord OSBORNE, from Welney:—By Mr. BETHEL, from Ridgway. For the removal of Civil Disabilities from the Jews, by Mr. A. DAWSON, from Dundalk. By the same hon. Member, from the same place, for the extension of the Elective Franchise.

Mr. BURREL brought in a Bill to regulate the appointing of Special Juries in Sussex.

The Speaker informed the House that he had been to the King's Palace and presented the Address of the House, when his Majesty was pleased to return the following most gracious Answer:—

"I cordially thank you for the assurances you have given me in your dutiful and loyal Address. No endeavours shall be wanting on my part to promote the true interests, and to secure and confirm the affection of my people."

MR. HUME'S ADVICE TO MINISTERS.] On the Chancellor of the Exchequer moving that the House resolve itself to-morrow into a Committee of Supply,

Mr. *Hume* rose, he said, for the purpose of impressing on Ministers the necessity —the important necessity—of their communicating, previous to their going into a Committee of Supply, the line of conduct, that is, of general policy, which they meant to pursue. Their not having done so was the cause of great public alarm, and by that means of great loss of property to individuals. It was feared, from the tone of the King's Speech with respect to Belgium, and of the explanation which Ministers had offered of that Speech, that they meant to plunge this country into a war, the consequence of which must be most ruinous. He was satisfied that they had no such intention; but still he felt, in common with many intelligent persons in that House and elsewhere, that it was impossible for any man to say where our "conference, for the tranquillity of Belgium," would end. Indeed, so great was the alarm consequent upon our intended negotiations, that he understood the funds had that day fallen from two to three per cent lower than they had been since the first announcement of the late French Revolution. It was, therefore, highly incumbent on Ministers to satisfy the public mind as to their intentions.

Motion agreed to.

ABOLITION OF THE OATH OF ABJURATION.] Mr. *C. W. Wynn* rose, to move for leave to bring in a Bill, for doing away with the necessity of taking the Oath of Abjuration on the acceptance of Civil Office, and of the Oaths taken by the Members of that House before the Lord Steward. He had last Session given notice of his intention; so that it would not be necessary for him then to explain more than the general purport of his measure. It might be asked *in limine*, as an objection to abolishing the Oath of Abjuration, where was the harm in taking it? why, therefore, do away with it? The answer was, that all useless and unnecessary oaths were mischievous, by their tendency to lower the respect and sanction with which oaths should be regarded. This was evident to every man who had experience in Sessions Courts, and other places where oaths were frequent and formal. Then as to the necessity for the oath. Where was the necessity of abjuring a dynasty that was no longer in existence? At present no member, however remote, of the House of Stuart lived, the last having been dead twenty-six years. There could be no apprehensions now concerning a Pretender to disturb the reigning family on the Throne, and therefore no necessity for the Oath of Abjuration. Indeed, if ever there was a favourable time for abolishing that oath, it was the present, with a Monarch the most deservedly popular of any in our annals on the Throne. The right hon. Gentleman, after stating that he would not propose a new form of oath as a substitute, proceeded to say that his next object was to do away with the necessity of Members of that House taking the usual oaths before the Lord Steward. The ground or occasion of this regulation, like the preceding, was no longer in existence, as the history of its origin would show. When the Lord Steward first administered these oaths to Members, the house—that is, the chamber in which the sittings were held—was considered as part of the royal palace, over which he presided as the first judicial authority; but such he need not say was not the case at present. The usage was retained, on the ground that it was the only check on persons not Members voting for a Speaker; but surely he who would vote for a Speaker, not being a Member, would not scruple to take the oaths before the Lord Steward. In point of fact, it was no check, and indeed no such check was necessary. Great difficulties and inconveniences, besides, might arise from the present regulation, to which it presented no counterbalancing advantage. What if the office of Lord Steward was vacant at the meeting of a new Parliament? There was an end to their proceedings, or rather there could be no beginning, and the public business could not be transacted. Nor was this merely a supposititious case. In 1641, there was no Lord Steward, and the House was obliged to address the King to appoint one, to enable them to go on with the public business. And in 1801, in consequence of the inopportune resignation of the Lord Steward, an Act had to be passed, to exempt Members from the penalties against entering the House without having taken the oaths before that officer. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by moving for leave to bring in a bill to repeal so much of the Acts of 13 William 3, c. 6; 1 Anne, c. 22; 6 Anne, c. 23; 1 George 1, c. 13; 6 George 3, c. 53; 5 Eliz. c. 1: 7 James 1, c. 6. and 1 William and Mary, c. 8; as requires the Oath of Abjuration to be taken, and the assurances to be subscribed in Scotland, and as directs certain oaths to be taken by Members of the House of Commons, before the Lord Steward or his deputy.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* entirely concurred in the right hon. Gentleman's proposition; and could see no reason why any oath should be required from Members except the Oath of Allegiance. He begged, however, to call the attention of the right hon. Baronet opposite, to the extraordinary difference between the oaths prescribed to the Protestant, and the oath prescribed to the Roman Catholic Member of that House. The latter, which was admirably framed, was infinitely better than the former; for in it, the Oaths of Abjuration, Allegiance, and Supremacy were embodied in a much more intelligible and rational form than that of the three oaths which the Protestant Member was obliged to take. The Roman Catholic Member was exempted from the necessity of swearing, that no foreign Prince or Prelate had any spiritual jurisdiction in this realm. Now to him it appeared most extraordinary that the Protestant Member who never could be supposed to believe that any foreign Prince or Prelate had any spiritual jurisdiction in this realm, was called upon to negative such a supposition on oath, while the Roman Catholic Member, who of course did entertain such a belief, was not called upon to comply with any such obligation. He hoped that means would be taken to simplify the existing oaths; preserving the only oath which appeared to him to be necessary—the Oath of Allegiance.

Mr. *O'Connell* supported the Motion; and recommended the abolition rather than the alteration of the oaths in question. There was no country in the world in which so many oaths were required; and it was unquestionably desirable to dispense with as many of them as possible. For every purpose, and for no purpose, were oaths taken. In the Universities the oaths taken were absolutely frightful. So, too, in the Revenue of the Customs and Excise. With respect to what had fallen from the hon. member for Kirkcudbright, it should be considered that it was consistent with the belief of a Protestant Member to swear that the Pope neither had nor ought to have any spiritual jurisdiction in this realm. But the Roman Catholic Member could not be required to swear that, for he believed that the Pope had a spiritual jurisdiction over him. It was most desirable to adopt some means by which so solemn a sanction for the security of life and property as an oath, should have the respect paid to it which was its due. If, however, the lower classes saw the subject treated with indifference by the higher, the effect would be most injurious. He would appeal to the moral and religious feeling of every man in the House if such were not the case.

Lord *Nugent* expressed his earnest hope that as soon as circumstances would permit, every civil distinction would be abolished. So long, however, as the Protestant and the Roman Catholic Members were called upon to take different oaths at the Table of that House, all which could had been done to facilitate so desirable an object. He confessed, however, that he agreed with the hon. and learned member for Waterford, that there were higher and deeper reasons for acquiescing in the proposed measure. He did not know what sacrifice he would not cheerfully make, to abolish one of those impious appeals to the Almighty which were now so frequent. Every moral and religious consideration required that the number of oaths should be reduced as much as possible. A great many petitions had been put into his hands on the subject. It had been his intention to bring it under the consideration of the House; and he had contemplated showing the scandalous multiplicity of the oaths taken in this country, by moving for a Return of the number taken in a certain period, with reference either to the Customs or to the Excise. Having some difficulty, however, as to the form of his Motion he had consulted the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the subject; and, in a few minutes he was satisfied that the returns would be so voluminous and overwhelming, that it would be impossible to produce them. This very circumstance, however, was in itself the strongest argument for setting to work with an honest and firm determination to limit the number of oaths as much as possible.

Mr. *R. Palmer* expressed his cordial concurrence in the measure, and a wish that both Protestants and Catholics should take the same oaths.

Mr. *Cresset Pelham* expressed his hope, that the Legislature would not repeal or alter that part of the Abjuration Oath in which those who took it declared their attachment to our present race of Sovereigns, they being descendants of the Electress Sophia.

Sir *R. Peel* understood his right hon. friend to have two objects in view in his present Motion. The first was, to dispense with the necessity of taking, before the Lord Steward, oaths which were afterwards taken with greater solemnity at the Table of the House; and the second was, to dispense with the necessity of declaring, that the descendants of the person falsely pretending to be Prince of Wales, had no claim whatever to the Throne. He would candidly confess that he had not had leisure to consider this subject; but his first impression was, that there was no objection to the accomplishment of those two objects. At the same time that he said this, he reserved to himself the liberty of further considering this question; and if he discovered any objections to his right hon. friend's proposal, he should reserve to himself the right of opposing his bill at some future stage. At present he saw no difficulties in the way of his right hon. friend's proposition, and he acquiesced in granting permission to bring in the bill. He must confess, that the longer he lived, the more clearly did he see the folly of yielding a rash and precipitate assent to any political measure. He therefore would not pledge himself not to oppose this bill. There might be objects attained by it, which even his right hon. friend himself did not at that moment perceive. If it should appear to him that there were such objects, that would be an additional reason to him to oppose the bill. He should certainly object to the total repeal of the Oath of Abjuration, though there were parts of it which might now unquestionably be dispensed with. It was right to require individuals to pledge themselves to support the succession to the Throne, as limited to the Princess Sophia and her heirs, being Protestants; but it was unnecessary to retain that part of it which abjured all allegiance to the descendants of James 2nd. Indeed, the House, in framing the oath to be taken by its Roman Catholic Members, had omitted that part of the Oath of Abjuration which contained the declaration against James 2nd and his descendants. The oath taken by the Catholic Member was this, "I do faithfully promise to maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the Crown, which succession, by an Act entitled 'An Act for the further limitation of the Crown, and better securing the rights and liberties of the subject,' is, and stands, limited to the Princess Sophia, Electress of Hanover, and the heirs of her body, being Protestants, hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto any other person claiming or pretending a right to the Crown of these realms." Now, there could be no claimant for the Throne at present, as a descendant of James 2nd; but if the strictness of hereditary descent were to be considered, other claimants for it might, perhaps, be found, deriving their claim from a higher stock than James 2nd. He was unwilling to make any distinction between the oaths taken by Protestants, and those taken by Roman Catholic Members. He should therefore reserve to himself, if he so thought fit, the right of retaining all those parts of the Oath of Abjuration which had no reference to the claims of the descendants of James 2nd. He thought that the time had now fully come, in which the House might safely omit all reference to the Pretender and his family; and, if so, it was wrong to encumber the oath by an abjuration of allegiance, which no circumstances could call again into existence. He hoped that he had sufficiently explained the limitations under which he was willing to grant to his right hon. friend leave to bring in his bill. With respect to what his right hon. friend had said on the subject of taking the oaths before the Lord Steward, he was not prepared to say, that his right hon. friend had convinced him that Members ought to vote for a Speaker without taking some oath, although he had convinced him that there might be much inconvenience in their being compelled to take the oaths exclusively before the Lord Steward.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* wished to ask the right hon. Baronet if he did not think that the Oath of Allegiance was the only oath which ought to be taken by Members of Parliament on their admission to their seats.

Sir *R. Peel* observed, that the inquiry of the hon. Member showed the necessity of the caution which he had already recommended. The effect of declaring that the Oath of Allegiance was sufficient, would be at once to decide the question agitated last Session, with respect to the admission of Jews into the House. If it were proper that such an admission should take place, the object ought to be effected by a direct motion, and not by a side-wind.

Sir *C. Wetherell* thought, that this Oath of Abjuration ought not to be hastily abolished: for he had read in some Roman Catholic authors of great learning, research, and talent, that they considered the title of the House of Sardinia to the Crown of these realms as dormant,—not as extinguished. [*Mr. O'Connell cried "Name."*] Delicacy would have induced him not to mention the name of the author to whom he had alluded: but as he had been called upon to give up the name, he would say at once that he was alluding to Mr. Butler. If they would only take the trouble of looking at Mr. Butler's Memoirs or Reminiscences, and the chapter which he had inserted in them upon the collateral claims of the house of Sardinia, they would see that their title was supposed to be dormant, but not extinguished. For these reasons he thought that the right hon. Secretary had done right in putting the House upon its guard against the difficulties which might ensue from giving up that part of the Oath of Abjuration which negatived the claims of the descendants of James 2nd. According to his opinion, there were not more than two or three words in the Oath of Abjuration which were superfluous. He would not say that, for the sake of saving his lungs the expression of two or three idle words, he would efface from the Statute-book this Oath, which, for various reasons, might be advisable. He should, therefore, decline pledging himself, either one way or other, on this subject at present.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that he wished to prevent a misconception from going abroad,

—namely, that Mr. Butler had recognized the title of some other persons than that of the reigning family to the Throne of these realms. Now, Mr. Butler had repeatedly taken the oath to support the succession to the Throne, as it stood, limited to the House of Brunswick, being Protestants, and descendants of the Electress Sophia. Had Mr. Butler thought that any other family possessed a superior title to the Throne of these realms, Mr. Butler would never have taken that oath. The talent and research of Mr. Butler, as well as his loyalty and learning, were well known, and he hoped that the learned Gentleman, who had unintentionally cast a reflection upon Mr. Butler's character, would have the candour to retract it, as undeserved.

Sir *C. Wetherell:* I have said nothing offensive, I hope, to Mr. Butler. I am sure that if I did, I meant it not. I should not even have mentioned his name, had I not been so pointedly called upon to do so.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn*, in reply, said, he was happy to find that the principal objection to his measure was, that it did not go far enough. He was of that opinion himself; but there were many reasons why he had not brought in a more extensive measure; but he must say, that he wished other public bodies would likewise consider the propriety of a revision of the oaths administered to their members. In the Universities, for instance, some of the oaths were extremely absurd. In taking the degree of Master of Arts, he, in common with many other Gentlemen who heard him, had been obliged to take various oaths, most useless and absurd; amongst others, there was an oath, that he should not assent to the restoration to his degree of some person whose name he forgot, and the recollection of whose offence was lost in the antiquity of the period in which he existed. No one, not even those the best acquainted with the antiquities of the University, could state the ground upon which the reference was made to this person in the oath. Every person, however, taking the degree of Master of Arts, must swear that he would not consent to the restoration to his degree of a person whose bones must have long ago mouldered into dust. The frequency of oaths was highly objectionable, and calculated to diminish their solemnity and value. In ancient times various oaths were taken without scruple by the same individual; and even in our own times, how many individuals are there living, who, in the French Revolution, for instance, took different oaths, as different parties and principles obtained dominion. It was impossible that such examples should not weaken the obligation of an oath. In reference to what had fallen from the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Sir C. Wetherell) he could assure him, that his intention was to strengthen, not weaken, the pledges given by Members of that House to support the reigning family. The hon. and learned Member seemed to think, that there were only two or three words objectionable in the Oath of Abjuration; but if he would read the second paragraph of that oath, he would not find in it one word that was necessary.

Leave was given to bring in the Bill.

TREATIES RELATIVE TO THE NETHERLANDS.] Mr. *Hume* rose to move for information respecting our relations with foreign Powers, particularly with Belgium and Holland, which had formerly, he believed, been laid before the House. He was desirous that all the papers upon this subject should be collected and laid on the Table, that they might be ready to be referred to by all the Members of that House, whenever occasion might require. He was specially anxious that this should be effected, because, in another place, it had been stated by one of the Ministers of the Crown, that the future actions of the Government, with respect to Belgium, would depend upon the treaties by which it was bound; and as the Members of that House would have eventually to decide upon an examination of these treaties, he trusted there would be no objection to their being laid before them. He wished to remind the House of what happened with regard to Portugal. The treaties with that country were, for the most part, of at least 120 years' standing, and were supposed to have lapsed, until one of our Ministers, at the time troops were ordered to Portugal, declared that they were in operation, and the House was called on to act on them forthwith, although great difference of opinion prevailed as to the necessity of that line of conduct. He therefore hoped, that Government would not object to have those papers laid on the Table. The hon. Member moved for copies of all the existing Treaties between his Britannic Majesty and Foreign Powers, respecting Holland and Belgium; and also respecting the kingdom of Portugal.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, he had no objection to the production of those papers; but really, all that was material might be found by reference to documents already published. He therefore thought, that on a principle of economy the Motion was unnecessary; but, unfortunately, the hon. Member always objected to his economy. Every thing in the least necessary for all legitimate subjects of debate was of easy access.

Mr. *Hume* said, the treaties might be copied, and then it would be for the House to consider, whether they should be printed or no.

Sir *Robert Peel* observed, that the too frequent orders for the copying out of long documents already published, occasioned a great increase in the number of persons employed in the public offices. All the necessary treaties might be found in the "Annual Register."

Mr. *Hume* was glad to see the right hon. Gentleman so economical; but he suggested that the printing of those papers might perhaps prevent a war. How were they to know what treaties Ministers referred to? He (Mr. Hume) had himself a good library, but how was he to find out the treaties in his books? Besides, there were many hon. Members who had not received copies of the treaties already laid on the Table.

Sir *R. Peel* observed, the system of providing all parliamentary documents for new Members, would be one of profuse expenditure—it would cost at least 40,000*l.*—and, besides, why had the library been established, if not to afford hon. Members an easy access to information upon such subjects. Either to reprint the Treaty of Vienna, or that of Paris, would be ridiculous: but if there was any other Treaty required, which was not of easy access, he would cheerfully pledge himself to produce it.

Mr. Hume expressed himself satisfied.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, Nov. 5.

Minutes.] Petitions presented. For the abolition of Negro Slavery, by the Attorney-General, from Malton:—By Mr. M. A. Taylor, from Durham:—By Sir C. Lemon, from Truro:—By Mr. M'Clintock, from Dundalk:—By Sir W. Heathcote, from Southampton:—By Colonel Lygon, from Tenbury:—By Sir W. Gordon, from Launceston:—By Sir C. Smith, from Pontefract:—By the Marquis of Blandford, from Woodstock:—By Mr. Tyrell, from Essex:—By Mr. Bell, three petitions from Northumberland:—By Mr. Shaw, three from Dublin:—By Lord Ebrington, three from Devonshire:—By Mr. Pendarvis, seventeen from Cornwall:—By Mr. Wm. Cavendish, four from York:—By Mr. Evans, four from Leicester:—By Mr. Arbuthnot, from Ashburton:—By Mr. Sandford, from Frome, Somersetshire:—By Sir J. Cotterell, from Hereford. By Mr. O'Connell, against the return of the Member for the County of Louth. By the same hon. Member, from certain Inhabitants of Armagh, complaining of the sitting Member for that Borough, and praying a Repeal of that Act of George 2nd, which first dispensed with the law requiring the elected and the electors to be residents of Boroughs in Ireland; from Debtors in the Marshalsea (Dublin), complaining of the Insolvent Debtors Laws; against the Returns, from Romney, Armsgh, Hastings, and Louth.

The Speaker took the Chair this day at three o'clock, according to the new regulation with respect to the hour of sitting for the despatch of business.

Riots in Ireland.] Mr. O'Connell moved for a Return of the number of persons killed and wounded in Ireland in the various contests with the police.

Mr. *Doherty* said, it was impossible that any such return could be made. The number of killed might be known, but there were no means of ascertaining the number of wounded.

Mr. *O'Connell* expressed his surprise to find, that the lives of the people were of so little value in Ireland that the Government could give no satisfactory account of the results of the contests in which they were sacrificed.

Sir *H. Hardinge* said, that the number of killed in the affrays, between the constabulary force armed on one side, and the people also armed on the other, were ascertained by the return of the Coroner, who inquired into the cause of death; but it must be known to every man that no account was taken of the number of wounded. He begged at the same time to express his opinion, that the constabulary force was most efficient as a body, and he believed, most sincerely, that to their good conduct and meritorious exertions, the preservation of the peace of Ireland was mainly to be attributed.

The return ordered, so far as it could be made.

Parliamentary Reform.] Mr. *O'Connell* presented a Petition from Cockermouth, praying for Reform, and declaring that Annual Parliaments, Universal Suffrage, and Vote by Ballot were necessary for the salvation of the country. The petitioners also said, and he thought their words prophetic, that vengeance would speedily fall on the heads of those who lent themselves to the oppression of the people. The Government was as imbecile as it was mischievous, for it had put into the mouth of one of the most popular Sovereigns who had ever sat on the Throne, a Speech which could have no other effect than to make him disliked by his subjects. What else, however, could they expect when there was insanity at the helm? He said insanity, and he was justified in saying it, because the Premier, but one year before his elevation, declared that he should be mad if he thought himself capable of filling the situation of Prime Minister of this country. He had since accepted that situation, and, therefore, he (Mr. O'Connell) felt he was at liberty to say that insanity ruled over the destinies of the nation.

Mr. *Beaumont*, although one of the most ardent friends of liberty, felt himself called on to protest against the sentiments of the hon. member for Waterford, and to deprecate the use of expressions which he considered abominable, and language which he must characterise as most offensive. As one of those who had always proved themselves the friends of liberty both in and out of that House, he deprecated the use of such language; and hoped the hon. Member would refrain from using it in future.

Mr. *Arbuthnot* said, that if his Majesty's Ministers were thought to be unworthy of the confidence of the House and the country, it was in the power of the Members to express that opinion, and effect their removal; but he thought that it would be derogatory to the character of Parliament to take any notice of language such as that now addressed to them.

Mr. *O'Connell* justified the expression he had used. What else was it but adopting the Duke of Wellington's own words?

Mr. *Beaumont* repeated his hope that the hon. Member would, for the future, preserve a greater temperance of language, although he might feel as strongly as he liked.

Mr. *Croker* was much surprised, that the hon. member for Waterford, if he felt so strongly averse from the language of the Speech from the Throne, had not recorded that feeling more effectually, by taking the sense of the House on the subject when that Speech was under its consideration the other night, and when he had the opportunity of ascertaining the feelings of the Members in one of the most numerous assemblies ever congregated on such an occasion. He protested against a declaration such as they had heard from the hon. Member, so immediately after he had given his assent to an Address in reply to the Speech which he so heavily condemned. He did not, however, protest so much against the language of the hon. Member, nor was he disposed to read him a friendly lecture, like the member for Northumberland (Mr. Beaumont); but he protested against such attacks being directed against the members of his Majesty's Government, at a moment when there was not one of the persons attacked in the House to reply to them.

Mr. *Hobhouse*, on the part of all those who dissented from the terms of the Speech from the Throne, protested on his part against the conclusion of the hon. Secretary for the Admiralty, that they or the House were at all pledged to the principles of the Speech, because they allowed the Address to pass without opposition. Even the right hon. Gentleman, the Secretary for the Home Department, had expressly declared that the House was not pledged to the terms of the Speech. by agreeing to the formality of an Address, He believed, indeed, that the language of that Speech, and the declaration respecting Reform, which followed it, had armed new opponents against the Ministry, and that many of the greatest friends of the Government were disposed to withdraw from it their support. What confidence, indeed, could the country have in such a Government? What could be expected from a Ministry which left the destinies of Ireland in the hands of an individual? For that they were so was plain, from the admissions made in that House. That hon. Member had been charged with an attempt to produce a rebellion, and he had replied with a modesty, peculiar to himself, and which he had no doubt was perfectly well founded—"No, I did not excite the people to rebellion; I prevented a rebellion." The Government, however, which left in the power of an individual the means of exciting or preventing a rebellion was unworthy of the confidence of the House or of the country. He trusted that the hon. Secretary would learn more accurately what took place in the House before he again reproved hon. Members for inconsistency.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that so far from being open to the censure contained in the speech of the hon. Secretary, he had actually seconded the Amendment to the Address moved by the noble member for Woodstock.

Mr. *Croker* said, that his observations applied not to the fact of the hon. Member having spoken against the Address, and seconded the Amendment, of which he was aware, but to the fact that he had not ventured to take the sense of the House on that Amendment.

Mr. *John Wood* said, that he came up to town with a strong disposition to look with favour on the acts of the Government during the present crisis, but the declaration respecting reform had totally changed his opinions. The Duke of Wellington, Prince of Waterloo, had, like his brother Minister, Prince Polignac, issued his Ordinances against Reform, and was determined to abide the issue, in spite of the opinions of the people.

The Petition laid on the Table.

REVENUES OF LANCASTER AND CORNWALL.] Mr. *Harvey*, in moving for a Return of the Expenses of the Management of the Crown Lands, and an Account of the number of Leases granted, Fines paid, and Sales made, whether privately or by public auction, since the year 1786, begged at the same time to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether he was to understand that the announcement in his Majesty's Speech respecting the relinquishment of the hereditary revenues of the Crown, applied to those of Cornwall and Lancaster?

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* said, that his Majesty's resignation of the hereditary revenues of the Crown did not comprise those of Cornwall and Lancaster, because those of Cornwall never became the property of the Crown, unless when there was no Heir-apparent of the Throne; and the revenues of Lancaster had been, from a very early period, subject to peculiar regulations, totally independent of its authority.

The Return ordered.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.] Mr. *D. W. Harvey* said, he had a Resolution to submit to the House, but as he had not had an opportunity of communicating its purport to the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Peel), he should take leave to propose it to the House, and leave it open to any objection, on the subject of want of notice, which might be made against it. The Resolution was to this effect:—"That every Member of that House be forthwith directed to make a return, to the best of his knowledge and belief, of the number of Voters in the City or Borough which he represents, and whether they are all partially, or in what proportion, residents of the place he represents—whether he himself holds any office, civil, military, or otherwise—whether there are any and what duties attached to such place or office, and what are their nature and extent."

On the question being put,

Sir *R. Peel* said, he required no notice on the subject of such a Motion, as he was at once prepared to give it a decided negative.

Mr. *Bernal* asked, if the hon. Member had any objection to divide his Motion into parts. If not, he was prepared to support the latter part of it, although he could not consent to entail on the Members of that House the onerous and impracticable task demanded in the first part.

Colonel *Davies* also observed, that the returning officers of Boroughs and Cities were the only persons possessed of the information which the hon. Member required by the first part of the Motion. In many places a contest had not taken place for years, and how, in such a case, was the Member to obtain information with respect to the residency or number of the voters?

Mr. Harvey withdrew the Motion, with the understanding that he would renew it in another shape.

DISTRESS OF THE COUNTRY—INFLAMMATORY LANGUAGE.] Mr. *Kenyon* wished, before the House went into a Committee of Supply, to put a question to the right hon. Secretary of State. Although his Majesty's Speech abstained from all allusion to the topic, the right hon. Gentleman could not deny the existence of the greatest distress throughout the country; a distress, indeed, so deep and extensive, that unless means were taken to mitigate it, the most serious and alarming consequences might ensue. He was anxious to ascertain whether or not it was the right hon. Gentleman's intention to propose the appointment of a Select Committee, to take the national distress into consideration, and to endeavour to devise some plan for its alleviation. It was a subject which demanded the immediate notice of his Majesty's Government, and he should be happy to learn what steps Ministers meant to take respecting it. He regretted to see a passage in his Majesty's Speech which alluded to additional coercive measures; and he sincerely trusted that no such measures would be proposed.

Sir *Robert Peel* rose to answer the question which the hon. Gentleman had put to him. It was not his intention to propose the appointment of a committee to take into consideration the general distress of the country. As to the specific measures which his Majesty's Ministers intended to adopt, he hoped that their whole policy would show the disposition which they entertained to advance the prosperity of the country; although it could not be expected that he should now enumerate the precise measures that they might take. The hon. Gentleman was mistaken in supposing that any part of his Majesty's Speech alluded to measures of coercion. What his Majesty stated was, that he would exert all the existing means which the law and the constitution had placed at his disposal.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* expressed his regret that no committee to take the distress of the country into consideration was to be proposed by his Majesty's Government, and his hope that some hon. Member would step forward and make the proposition himself. If, however, the question were not taken up by abler hands, he should consider it his indispensable duty to move for an investigation of the distress under which the whole country was suffering, particularly the labouring classes. He should not do his duty to his constituents were he not to take this step. The question now was, not simply whether they would have reformation or not—they had to choose between reformation and absolute perdition. He had that day heard of a circumstance which proved the great falling-off that had taken place, and that was inevitable, in the receipts of the revenue. In one district in which the assessed taxes had formerly produced 10,000*l.*, there was a deficiency of 600*l.* Although it was his present intention to make the motion to which he had adverted, he would readily give way to any hon. Member better qualified for the undertaking; and he was, above all, particularly anxious that he might be relieved from the labour by his Majesty's Government, as a motion of that kind would come better from it than from any individual Member. One of the principal objects to which he should feel it his duty to call the attention of the House, would be the repeal of the duty on houses and windows; a duty which pressed most heavily on a large and valuable portion of the community.

Mr. *Stanley* requested the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer would state the order in which he meant to take the Estimates in the Committee of Supply.

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* said that it was his intention to go regularly through them, as in the last Session. It was his intention to submit to the House the propositions respecting the Civil List on Friday next, so that the Committee of Supply would not be required to sit until the Monday after.

Mr. *Stanley* gave notice, that on Monday week, on the Motion for going into the Committee of Supply, he would move certain Resolutions respecting the mode in which Parliament and the country had been led into an expenditure of 600,000*l.* on the Rideau Canal, by which a sum, to that amount, might be in future saved to the country.

Sir *John Bourke* wished to say, that he differed in *toto* from his hon. and learned friend the member for Waterford, on the question of the repeal of the Union. In the part of Ireland from which he came, the general feeling was decidedly against such a repeal; and he was confident that every independent, educated, and upright person in Ireland was equally opposed to that hon. and learned Gentleman's project. As to the distress which existed among the people of Ireland, that would, he believed, be best remedied by an advance of money to carry on public works.

The question was put, that the Speaker leave the Chair, for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of Supply?

Mr. *Hume* observed, that before the Speaker left the Chair, he wished to inform hon. Members that this was the period at which the Commons of England, if they had any complaint to make, or any grievance to represent, ought to make, or represent it. If their constituents had commissioned them for any such purpose, now was their time. In the execution of his own duty, and in compliance with the requests of his constituents, he now begged to ask his Majesty's Government whether —the whole country loudly demanding a relief from taxation—the Cabinet had made up their minds on that subject, as they had made up their minds on the subject of parliamentary reform? What he wanted was, an unequivocal answer—aye, or no. The next thing to having a request granted, was to put the person by whom it was made out of the misery of suspense. The people of England were at present looking most anxiously for the relief which they expected would be afforded them; and they would no longer be put off, as they had been heretofore, by promises of economy. Before, therefore, he could agree to vote away any of the public money, he must ask his Majesty's Ministers if it was their intention to alleviate the burthen of taxation which pressed so heavily upon the country; or if they were prepared to propose such a change in the present system of taxation as would remove the severity of the burden from the industrious to other classes. As to Parliamentary reform, it was quite unnecessary for him to ask Ministers what their intention was in that respect, after the declaration which had been made elsewhere, that the present system of representation was not only good, but the best that could possibly be imagined. He believed that the noble Duke at the head of the Government, and the right hon. Gentleman opposite, had declared at Manchester that they had no wish to retain their places, except while they were found to act in conformity to the wishes of the people. When, therefore, they found that they were not acting in conformity to the wishes of the people, he trusted that they would redeem that pledge. He hoped that the people would show their wishes by petitions to that House, and by all other legal means. He trusted, however, that the people would use no other but legal means. If he could make his voice heard from one end of the country to the other, he would exclaim to the people, "If you wish to obtain your rights, and to benefit the country, abstain from all acts of violence." From the use of all legal means of obtaining their object, the people ought not to allow themselves to be dissuaded. There were, unfortunately, in this country, a number of very ignorant, though perhaps well-meaning men, who, being alarmed themselves, endeavour to disseminate their terrors, and who, wishing to sustain the present system under all circumstances, depicted to others the evils and devastation to which they might be subject if they departed from it; as if any change must necessarily lead to occurrences similar to those which had taken place in other countries. He implored every real friend to his country to act himself, and to use all the influence which he might possess over others to induce them to act, in forwarding the great object of relieving the people by all lawful means; by petition and remonstrance, couched in bold but proper language. There were in that and the other House of Parliament so many individuals who were interested in the continuance of the present system, because it worked well as it respected them, that they adopted every possible means of insuring its continuance. It was not surprising that these place-holders should say to those over whom they possessed any influence, "Don't go to this meeting, or that assembly; Don't sign such a petition; Don't join in such a remonstrance." That, however, was not the advice which ought to be given to the people by persons who were not interested in the maintenance of the existing abuses. When he considered of what the Duke of Wellington had shown himself capable in other situations, he confessed that he was astonished at his present conduct. He must have received his political impressions from other countries. Austria, Russia, Prussia, must have pressed their opinions upon him. However, let his Majesty's Ministers now declare whether or not they intended to propose the reduction of the public burthens; aye, or no. He should be satisfied with either answer. But he wished unequivocally now to know what steps they intended to take, and he would state why. He confessed he had looked to them with hope and expectation. He spoke of it with regret; but weak as he was, he had been the dupe of the expressions of his Majesty's Government in the former Session. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had declared in the last week of the last Parliament, in answer to some very strong and pertinent observations from the hon. and learned member for Yorkshire, that he might rest perfectly satisfied as to the measures which his colleagues and himself meant to pursue; for that they should call on the people for support. Did the right hon. Gentleman or the Duke of Wellington mean to say that the people of England did not want reform—that they did not want reduction of taxation, or that they did want any interference in the affairs of Belgium? After that declaration, he (Mr. Hume) had hoped that he should hear in his Majesty's Speech some expression of due consideration for the sufferings of the people. Those sufferings were great; but they were wholly disregarded; they were set at nought. There was not even a paragraph in reference to them in his Majesty's Speech. He was apprehensive that some very insidious designs were on foot. So much confidence had he in the good sense of the working classes of the community, that he was very much afraid that the belief of the hon. member for Kent, that the outrages which had been committed there were not the work of the population of the country, was well founded. When he coupled this with the other proceedings of the noble Duke [*loud laughter, and cries of hear, hear!*]—Perhaps he was wrong in using the word "other." But he really had a poor opinion of those who were so easily led to laugh at a lapse of that kind; but who would, perhaps, let a good joke pass unnoticed. He really lamented to see, on all occasions, however serious, such a levity of manner in the House. It could not be necessary for him to say, that he did not think the Duke of Wellington had had anything to do with the fires in Kent. All these things, however, were making a deep impression in every part of the country. It behoved his Majesty's Government, if there were any means of remedying the evil, to use them. He now begged to put the question to the right hon. Gentleman, what his Majesty's Government meant to do? He had put a question to the right hon. Gentleman yesterday, which he had not had the courtesy to answer. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would answer his present question; and that the answer would be, that the members of the Cabinet had made up their minds to relieve the sufferings of the people, by reducing the burthen of taxation.

Sir *Robert Peel* expressed his surprise, that the hon. member for Middlesex should charge him with want of courtesy, in not answering his question yesterday. What he had understood the hon. Gentleman to say yesterday was, that he would put to him (Sir Robert Peel) this day, a question as to the probability of the occurrence of war. He had intended, if the hon. Gentleman had this day repeated his question, to have answered—that a perfect confidence might be entertained that the same motives which had hitherto induced his Majesty's Government to pursue a pacific policy, would continue; and that his Majesty's Government would make every possible effort, consistently, of course, with the honour and permanent interests of England, to maintain peace with the whole world. His Majesty's Government was deeply interested in the preservation of the general tranquillity. His Majesty, in his Speech from the Throne, declared that "the assurances of a friendly disposition which he continued to receive from all foreign Powers, justified the expectation that he should be enabled to preserve for his people the blessings of peace." It was impossible for him, consistently with his duty, to say more on the subject than, that since that declaration from the Throne, nothing had occurred to change or diminish the expectation which his Majesty had been induced to entertain, "that he should be enabled to preserve for his people the blessings of peace." The hon. member for Middlesex now asked, and required a positive and decisive answer to the question, whether his Majesty's Government intended to propose any reduction of taxation? He was confident, that on reflection, the hon. Gentleman's experience would show him that the question was a very improper one. He must certainly decline giving any answer to the question, either affirmatively or negatively. But suppose he were to answer the question affirmatively, did not the hon. Member well know that such an answer must be followed up at once by enumerating the specific objects to which the intended reduction was to be applied? No inference whatever ought to be drawn from his declining to answer the question, except that to do so would be inconvenient to the public. He appealed to every Member, of parliamentary experience, if anything could be more prejudicial than for one of his Majesty's Ministers, at the commencement of a Session, to give any answer to such a question as that which the hon. Gentleman had put to him? The hon. Gentleman talked of some pledge which he (Sir Robert Peel) had given last Session of the disposition of his Majesty's Government to defer to public opinion. What he had stated last Session was this fact:—that his Majesty's Government had made such an extensive reduction in the patronage of the Crown, that no administration could rely upon the permanent possession of office unless they felt themselves supported by the confidence of Parliament and the country. But the hon. Gentleman must not conclude from that declaration that any vulgar or common opinion, though expressed by the hon. Gentleman, would at all influence him in the discharge of his duty. If the hon. Gentleman joined in the vulgar imputation on public men that they were unduly influenced by their wish to retain the paltry emoluments of office; if he thought it necessary to caution the people against listening to the advice of such persons because they were interested in giving that advice; he knew not by what test the hon. Gentleman was prepared to prove the truth of his insinuations, but he knew that they were most uncharitable, and most unjust. The only considerations which his Majesty's Government had in contemplation were, the welfare of the people, and their permanent interest. The people must judge of their motives by their measures. If the House and the country suspected the motives and condemned the measures of his Majesty's Ministers, no inherent power or influence they possessed could maintain them in the Administration. When the hon. Gentleman talked of the proceedings of misguided men, he would ask him if the language which had been used in that House by himself, now the representative of the metropolitan county, and therefore, perhaps, possessed of a degree of importance greater than he had before enjoyed; he would ask him whether the language which he had used in the course of the present Session was not calculated to produce excitement and inflammation? When the hon. Member characterised the whole population of the country, without exception, as being in a starving condition—as reduced to a state of actual famine; or when he declared that unless certain measures were adopted, the day of vengeance would come, might not the excitement and inflammation which the hon. Gentleman lamented be unintentionally aggravated by the unguarded language he employed?

Colonel *Davies* protested against the practice of taunting hon. Members, when they remonstrated against the measures of Government, with a disposition to inflame and excite the people. He had never heard from his hon. friend any expressions which justified such taunts. What his hon. friend had said the other evening had been fully and satisfactorily explained, although it might suit the purpose of the right hon. Gentleman, for the purpose of making an undue impression on the House, to state his own version of the matter. When his hon. friend talked of interested persons, he did not allude to such persons as the right hon. Gentleman, but to underlings, to tax-gatherers and others, who were, of course, all interested in the maintenance of the present system. It was to such persons that his hon. friend alluded; not to such persons as the right hon. Gentleman. He would do the right hon. Gentleman the justice to say, that he did not believe he was influenced by any love of paltry emolument or of place. He had already shown that he was superior to any such miserable considerations. But that had no influence on his opinion of the public conduct of his Majesty's Government; and he would say, that if they were not the most discreet and clever of Ministers, they were as bold as any that ever existed; not even excepting Prince Polignac. The Duke of Wellington had expressed his determination to resist every species of reform. He had gone so far as to tell the House of Lords that "if he were to form a Legislature, he would create one—not equal in excellence to the present, for that he could not expect to be able to do—but something as nearly of the same description as possible." The right hon. Gentleman, not to be behind-hand with his noble colleague, had told them that evening, forsooth, that his Majesty's Government were not prepared to say, that they had any intention of reducing the taxation of the country. If persons suffering distress felt disaffection, whose fault was it? Was it not the fault of those who drove them into cherishing that feeling, by resisting the signs of the times? The best friends of the Ministers were those who told them the real condition of the country; their worst enemies were those who blinded them to that condition. Was it possible that on so important a subject as the reduction of taxation, his Majesty's Government had not been able, in the course of so many months, to come to a decision? If any resolution had been formed, why not answer his hon. friend's question? Not having done so, they must expect to have every obstacle thrown in their way; and to find the public business impeded, if not altogether stopped.

Mr. *Curteis* rose to ask, whether the hon. member for Middlesex, who generally spoke with great courtesy of public men, intended to revoke the expression which he had used when he insinuated, or rather said, that the noble Duke was at the bottom of the burnings in Kent. He thought that it would be for the interest of the public for the House to come at once to a regular division on the conduct of Ministers, instead of wasting time in a Guerilla warfare on such discussions as the present. Such a division would bring on the tug of war, and the country would then know how far the Ministry was likely to enjoy the confidence of the present Parliament.

Mr. *Hume* said, that he rose out of courtesy to the hon. Member who had just sat down, although he believed that he might appeal to the whole House that there was no necessity, after what he had formerly said, to reply at all to the hon. Member's question. He could assure the hon. Member that if he thought that either the Duke of Wellington, or any other of his Majesty's Ministers, were capable of such conduct, he should lose not a moment—nay, he should be foremost—in bringing that subject under the immediate consideration of Parliament.

Mr. *Baring* said, that he rose with reluctance to prolong a discussion of so tedious and unsatisfactory a nature; but certain circumstances which had occurred in the debate, and certain expressions which had been used by his hon. friend, the member for Middlesex, appeared to him to be of such a nature that they ought not to be passed over without notice. As far as his own experience went, he must say, that it was quite clear that we had not had, since the conclusion of the war, any period in which the essential interests of the country were moving more satisfactorily than they were moving a few months ago. He did not mean to say that they were moving with enormous profits and splendid results,—all he meant to say was, that the returns of our commerce, though moderate, were still satisfactory, When the great events which had recently occurred upon the Continent became known on this side of the Channel, they had a tendency to produce general excitement in one quarter and general apprehension in another—two causes, which had in some degree, but not to any great extent, been prejudicial to the interests of our commerce. From the year 1815 to the commencement of the year 1830, we had been in circumstances of difficulty from the manner in which we had tampered with the currency; during the last year we had been recovering from the fever into which our former measures had cast us and, with a little management and forbearance, he believed that our recovery would soon be complete. If there was any one thing which every man who wished well to his country, and especially to the labouring classes, ought to avoid more than another, it was disturbing the general tranquillity by those outrageous and extravagant assertions which were now so rife among us, and which, with all due regard to his hon. friend the member for Middlesex, whose great services he was at at all times ready to acknowledge, he must say had been uttered by him with more than usual vehemence on the present occasion. If it were true that the majority of the Members of that House acted upon mere mercenary views, without any regard to public principle,—if it were true that the Majority of them were receiving large emoluments out of the public purse,—a fact which he for one did not believe,—the sooner those circumstances were clearly explained to the country, the better would it be for its interests. He therefore could not help expressing a hope, that the motion which the hon. member for Colchester intended to make in a few nights, calling for a return of the emoluments, civil and military, received by Members of that House, would be granted, in order that the extent of those emoluments might be distinctly known. It was, however, his opinion that a more extravagant, and if unfounded, a more mischievous misrepresentation than this, had never been propounded by any public man in any country. That public men holding public offices were to be paid by the country was a principle of our Constitution, which had always been applauded by the best Judges of Constitutional policy, both at home and abroad. Several of the most acute statesmen in America had expressed their approbation of our practice of allowing the great officers of Government to have seats in Parliament, and had lamented that a similar practice was not permitted in their own country. Unless his hon. friend, the member for

Middlesex, was prepared to say, that the great offices of State should be without emolument, and should, therefore, be monopolized by men of large fortune,—a practice most injurious in a mixed democracy like our own—the present system of allowing individuals who received salaries for filling efficient situations under the Crown, could not be dispensed with. The assertions of the hon. member for Middlesex on this subject might surprise those Gentlemen who were new Members of the House, but they would produce no effect upon those who, like him, had sat for five-and-twenty years in Parliament, and had witnessed the great reductions which had been made of late years in all our establishments. For his own part, he must say, that he was not aware that the great officers of State were at all over-paid. If they were, let his hon. friend, when the estimates came before the House, point out where the over-payment was; and he thought that he might appeal to his own past conduct in Parliament to show that he should not be backward in concurring in any reduction which could be fairly, and properly, and safely made. But in the present state of the public mind, which, in spite of the exemplary moderation exhibited by the Majority of the nation, was still a little excited, there was no occasion for public men to make use of inflammatory language, to promote a state of things which, if it arrived, would be productive of as much injury to themselves as it would be to the rest of the country. In a placard which he had seen posted up that day, he saw it stated, that out of the public money the Earl of Eldon received 50,000*l.* a year.

Mr. *Hume.*—Does that originate with me? If not, why mention it?

Mr. *Baring*—" My hon. friend does me gross injustice when he supposes that I am going to make my speech entirely about him. I was mentioning an exaggerated statement which I had seen in a placard out of doors, and was proceeding to correct it. My hon. friend gets up to correct and stop me, but I never knew him get up to remove an exaggeration, though I hold it to be as much the duty of a public man to remove exaggerations as it is to detail fairly the real grievances of his country. But to proceed. I saw in that same placard a list of other exaggerations, equally unfounded with that which I have just mentioned. Of that noble Lord, in his political character at least, it is pretty well known that I never have been an admirer: but yet I think it only common justice to state, that that noble Lord receives no more than a pension of 4,000*l.* a year as a retiring Chancellor; and I doubt whether any man, who recollects the laborious services of Lord Eldon for so many years, as a Judge, will say that such a retiring pension is too much. If it be, let it be brought fairly under our consideration, and not made the subject of the most unfounded exaggeration." Mr. Baring then proceeded to observe, that it was impossible to see such exaggerations without being sensible of the object for which they were made. Knowing that the Members of the House of Commons were good for nothing if they did not follow up the opinions of those hundreds and thousands of people out of doors, who, from the general spread of education, were able to judge of them, their proceedings, and their merits, he would proclaim at once the idleness of endeavouring to conceal from them anything which had a tendency to display the mode of expending the public money; but at the same time he would proclaim, as a general rule, the duty of public men showing up and disavowing the exaggerations which were abroad on such a subject. With regard to the question which had been put to the right hon. Gentleman opposite, as to his intention to repeal any taxes, he would only say, that the best course which the House could adopt would, in his opinion, be that of going into the Committee of Supply, and there performing the business of the public. If in that committee the Minister should propose any grant which hon. Gentlemen might deem improper, then would be the time, and there would be the place, for objecting to it. Let hon. Gentlemen, therefore, consider in the first place, whether it were practicable to reduce the supplies; for if such a scheme were practicable, then they might properly think of reducing the amount of taxation. In conclusion, he admitted that distress of some kind must always be found in a large manufacturing country like our own, but he denied that at present it was anything like that which had generally prevailed in the country since the conclusion of the last peace. It was a gross exaggeration to describe the English as a starving people. Any difficulty by which the country was affected at present, had arisen from the excitement which prevailed on one hand, and from the apprehension which prevailed on the other. He was sorry, however, to be compelled to observe, that the course which had been pursued that evening was calculated to increase it materially.

Lord *Howick* complained, that the hon. member for Callington had read his hon. friend, the member for Middlesex, a most unnecessary and uncalled-for lecture on the exaggerations which were abroad, and of which his hon. friend was perfectly guiltless. He contended that the exaggeration prevalent out of doors was a sufficient justification of any hon. Member, who calmly and dispassionately stated within the House the real grievances of the people. The language which had been used by the hon. member for Middlesex, both on the present and on a former night, was perfectly justifiable in the present state of the country. With respect to reform in Parliament, he must say, that it was resisted only by those who had an interest in maintaining the present abuses. By abuses he did not mean the high and extravagant salaries merely which were paid to some public officers, but the influence and patronage which were in the gift of some of them, and quite as valuable, if not more so, than money. He must also condemn in the strongest terms, the declarations contained in the King's Speech respecting Belgium, and avow his dissatisfaction with the explanations which the right hon. Secretary had that night given respecting what he called the pacific intentions of the British Government.

Sir *R. Peel* repeated his former declaration, that our interference with the Netherlands was not made with a view of exciting, but of preventing, war. His Majesty had declared in his Speech, that he entertained the expectation that he should be able to preserve for his people the blessings of peace; and he had already assured the House—and he would repeat the assurance—that nothing had occurred since the delivery of that Speech which induced him to think that that expectation would be disappointed. In reply to the observations of the hon. member for Worcester, which, he said, proceeded throughout upon the erroneous supposition that he had accused the Gentlemen opposite of throwing firebrands among the people, he should only say, that he had made no such accusation. On a former evening he had used the word "intentionally," where he intended to have said "unintentionally." On the present occasion he had laid particular emphasis on the word "unintentionally," when he said that an hon. Member was using language which was calculated—unintentionally on his part—to create great excitement and inflammation among the people. He repeated his assertion that such language had been used. He asked whether it was consistent with truth to call the people of England a starving population? There might be partial distress in the country; some distress there always must be, from the very nature of things; but it was a gross exaggeration to say that the people of England were starving. He acquitted the hon. Member, as freely as the hon. Member acquitted the Duke of Wellington, of all intention to do mischief; but when he said, that, in his opinion, the Government ought to be displaced, there was a better and a milder way of saying it than by using such a phrase as "the day of vengeance will come." When the hon. Member was talking of a misguided and easily excited people, it was better to avoid using such language.

Mr. *Labouchere* wished to take that opportunity of asking the right hon. Gentleman a question. Had any report been received from the commission appointed last Session to inquire into the finances and expenditure of the Colonies?

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* said, that the commissioners had not yet completed their work, though they had made considerable progress in it. The result of their labours would, however, be shortly placed before the public.

Motion agreed to.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, Sir A. Grant, Chairman.

SUPPLY.—RECRIMINATION.] The paragraph in the King's Speech relative to the Estimates having been read,

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* moved that a Supply be granted to his Majesty.

Mr. *Hume* said, that though he had refrained from opposing the motion for the Speaker's leaving the Chair, it had not been because he was satisfied with the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. That statement had not convinced him that the Government did not intend to go to war. The right hon. Secretary had not told them whether it would be necessary for this country to have recourse to arms. With regard to the observations which the right hon. Secretary had thought proper to apply to him, he must say, he considered that he had great reason to complain of them. Much more reason had he to complain of the speech of the hon. member for Callington (Mr. Baring). That hon. Member had charged him with making exaggerated statements. What were those statements? When had he made such? Why did not the hon. Member point them out? He complained, too, of the right hon. Secretary for having raked up an expression which he had used in the warmth of debate the other night, or rather morning (for it was past two o'clock, he believed), which expression he had immediately explained. Was this the liberality of the right hon. Secretary? But this was the way in which it was sought to blind the House and the country, to the importance and the necessity of the main question,—which question was, whether there should or should not be a reduction of the burthens of the people. Had he ever made, and been obliged afterwards to recant, such exaggerated statements as the hon. member for Callington made respecting the Bishop of London one night last Session, which he came down and recanted the next night? If he had ever made exaggerated statements, and he had been told of having done so, he had always explained his error, as he always should be happy to do for the future; but, he repeated, he had never been guilty of such exaggerations as the hon. member for Callington had, and that hon. Member, therefore, had no right to charge him with making exaggerated statements, and not explaining them. He would say, that to misrepresent him in this manner was calculated to produce dangerous consequences. He was not surprised at this misrepresentation from the hon. member for Callington, because, generally, when that hon. Member spoke upon any question, he (Mr. Hume) was always in doubt, at the conclusion of the hon. Member's speech, which way the hon. Member had meant to argue, and on which side he meant to vote. He called upon the hon. member for Callington to state what he had ever said that was calculated to inflame the minds of the people? Surely the hon. Member could not have been in the House when he had spoken, for he had then solemnly deprecated all acts of violence on the part of the people, and had declared that such acts were calculated, not to advance their interests, but to furnish new grounds for disregarding their wishes. Was it a fit return for that to hold him up as an incendiary? But the hon. member for Callington had not only complained of his exaggerating the distress of the country, but had almost declared that there was no distress at all among the people. The hon. Member had certainly said, that the country was better off now than it had ever been before during the last fifteen years, and this was about the most incorrect statement that could be made. It might, however, be very well for the hon. member for Callington, with a good rent-roll, and no want of money right and left, to suppose that there was not much distress in the country. But his complaint was, that words had been put into his mouth which he never used, and that the proceedings in former debates had been this evening revived for the purpose of censuring him. The rules of the House forbade this practice, and therefore the right hon. Secretary had been disorderly and irregular. So, also, had the hon. member for Callington been, in alluding to what he had said on a former night; and when he alluded to any thing that had fallen from him that evening, he challenged the hon. Member to point out the expressions which were calculated to inflame the people. He had been misrepresented on more than one occasion. The other night, the hon. Alderman (Mr. Ald. Waithman) below him, having got "a bee in his bonnet," incorrectly attributed to him what he had never said, [*Cries of* "*Question.*"] Now, if during this Session he ever heard that word "Question" called, for the purpose of interrupting an hon. Member in debate, he gave fair warning that he would move that the Speaker do leave the Chair, and if only a few Members would stand by him, he would put a stop to that indecent custom. Nothing could be more indecent and unbecoming than for a set of men, who were utterly unworthy of places in the House, to come down there [*Cries of* "*hear, hear!*"] yes, pardon him, their conduct justified him in calling them "unworthy,"—to come down there to interrupt the Representatives of the people in the discharge of their duty. He did not mean to say that this cry came from Gentlemen connected with the Admiralty, but he had well remarked the corner from which the cry of "Question" constantly came, and he was determined, if the practice were persevered in, to bring the persons guilty of it before the Speaker by complaint. Yes, he would. Let them stay away if they pleased: he did not wish for their presence: but if they did come, let them conduct themselves like grave senators. The hon. member for Callington had told them that he had never heard of Members of Parliament being influenced by money, places, pensions, or sinecures. Good God! Where had the hon. member for Callington lived all his life? If the hon. Member thought that the system was all right, let him change his place in the House; let him take his situation behind the Treasury bench; but let them not have an enemy in their own quarters, and in their own camp. He did not like a snake in the grass. As to what the right hon. Secretary had said upon the same subject, he had only to remind the House, that in what he had said about clinging to the emoluments of office, he had not made any allusion to the bench on which the right hon. Secretary sat. It should, however, be recollected, that there were attached to office, rank, and power, and influence, which might make an impression on those who did not care for the emoluments of office. He would not detain the House any longer, and, after the unfair attacks that had been made upon him, he hoped it would not be thought that he had taken up time unnecessarily.

Mr. *Baring* said, that if, in addressing the House, he had ever assumed a tone or appearance which savoured of presumption or arrogance, no man could be more ashamed of such indecorum—no man more anxious to apologize for it—than himself. He trusted, however, that he had never so far forgotten himself,—that he had never been so insensible to the respect which was due from him to the House. If, however, such impropriety of conduct could be fairly charged against him, still a lecture upon such a subject could not possibly have come from a more unfit person than the hon. member for Middlesex. From the manner in which that hon. Member thought proper to address the House, a stranger might suppose that there was no Representative of the people in it but the hon. member for Middlesex,—no one who understood the affairs of Government but the hon. member for Middlesex, and that the hon. member for Middlesex was privileged to dictate, on all occasions, and that, too, not in the most becoming language, to all the rest of the Members who composed this branch of the Legislature. He, however, could assure the hon. member for Middlesex, that however unreasonable it might appear to him, he should insist upon his right of forming his own opinion of the measures that might be submitted to the House. If the hon. Member proposed, as he frequently had, measures calculated to benefit the country, he should continue to support him; and if the hon. Member proposed, as also he frequently had, measures of a contrary character, he should still feel it his duty to oppose him, however the hon. Member might be displeased with those who did not happen to view every thing in the same light as himself. Let him also assure the hon. Member, that he should not ask his advice as to his parliamentary conduct, nor allow himself to be dictated to by the hon. Member as to the place in the House he should occupy. He would not take the hon. Member as a guide, nor submit to him as a dictator. The hon. Member asked, of what exaggeration he had been guilty? To this he replied, without hesitation, that the whole tenour of his speech was exaggeration, and that it had a most inflammatory tendency. This, he thought, must, to the majority of the House, be as manifest as that, since the hon. Member had appeared in his new character, he had displayed himself, not as a debater, but as a dictator. But the hon. Member insisted upon an instance of the exaggeration charged against him. If it were worth while detaining the House with a repetition of the hon. Member's statements, it would not be difficult to give several instances; but this was not worth while, and he would content himself, therefore, with one instance. The hon. Member had represented that Members of that House, in voting money, were influenced by the desire of supporting corrupt institutions, and of feeding placemen and sinecurists. This was a misrepresentation, and one that was calculated to excite inflammation out of doors. If one-half, nay, if one-tenth—of the statements of the hon. Member were true, the Government of the country would be an Augean stable, that would not only require to be cleansed forthwith, but which would justify almost any measures that might be directed towards that object. These exaggerations and mis-statements,—

this conduct on the part of men who ought not to be insensible of the consequences they were calculated to produce,—made others who were more prudent, but not less ardent lovers of freedom than themselves, pause before they concurred in reforms to which there would otherwise be no objection. Such language and such conduct displayed anything but a desire to consult the welfare of the community. Upon the subject out of which the present discussion had arisen, he was totally at variance with the hon. Member. He considered it to be prudent, and rational, and statesmanlike, to consider how much money was necessary for the service of the country, and to compare that with the amount of the revenue. If, upon such comparison, it should appear that there was a surplus of revenue, that ought to be applied to the reduction of taxation. A very different course was insisted upon by the hon. Member, who called upon the Ministers, in the first instance, to reduce the taxation of the country,—or, in other words, to take so much from the revenue, before it was known whether the amount of the revenue, as it now stood, was sufficient for the service of the State. For his own part, he could not consider this to be either prudent or statesmanlike.

Mr. *Tennyson* said, that he was not in the habit of using strong language in addressing that House, let the subject of the discussion be what it might; and justice towards his hon. friend, the member for Middlesex, required him to say, that he did not hear him make use of any expressions which he himself would not have uttered; and his expressions did not deserve the strong remarks which had been made on them. The language used by his hon. friend was not such as to inflame the minds of the people, but was merely a representation of that state of public feeling at this moment to which he was desirous of calling the attention of Parliament. He differed from the opinion entertained by the hon. member for Callington, viz. that it was expedient to soften down the statements of public distress, for he must know that the public ferment was very great. Indeed, no one could deny it, and such ferment would be better allayed by individuals who held seats in that House, stating openly, and even in strong terms, their sentiments upon the subject, (provided the language be not of an exciting character) than by the line which the hon. member for Callington would adopt. The discontented portion of the public would be better satisfied to find that their grievances were exposed in energetic terms. On a former evening his hon. friend did, in the heat of debate, use a word which, on its being censured, he instantly retracted.—[Sir R. Peel said, "No."] His hon. friend retracted it in every sense in which the right hon. Gentleman had a right to condemn it, by explaining, that he merely referred to the removal of Ministers from their places. He admitted that the word "vengeance" was an inappropriate expression, but the explanation ought to have been accepted, and no further observation ought to have been made upon it. With respect to the Motion before the House, he was surprised that the Government should not have come down with some proposition calculated to give comfort to the people. Instead of doing that, Ministers availed themselves of the earliest opportunity to declare that nothing would be done to meet their wishes. First, they were told that not the slightest measure of reform was to be granted, and then that the Government was not prepared to state whether or not any reduction of taxes is to be made. The country was entitled to know whether any, and if any, what reductions were to be effected in the burthens which pressed so heavily on the people. The right hon. Gentleman declined giving any specific information to his hon. friend on the subject, but the House ought to be informed of the probable course that Ministers intended to follow. It was expected throughout the country that a great reduction of taxation would take place this year; and the answer of the right hon. Gentleman would produce nothing but dissatisfaction. Surely, if he were disinclined to enter into particulars, he might say whether any reductions were contemplated—whether the public service would require the same or a less sum than last year; although, until he heard what the new Representatives of the people might say, he might deem it expedient to defer any statement as to the particular taxes to be removed or reduced—a matter which might be hereafter arranged by the Chancellor of the Exchequer; but the general refusal to answer shewed, either that Ministers were unprepared to meet Parliament, or were determined to keep the public mind in a state of suspense, not necessary for the public service.

Colonel *Sibthorp* merely rose to say one word on the present occasion, as he had not an opportunity of doing so on Tuesday evening. If he had been able to attend, he should have supported the amendment of his noble friend, and should have expressed his opinion on the conduct of the Administration. He agreed with his hon. friend, the member for Bletchingly, that the country was entitled to know, whether it was the intention of Ministers to propose any reduction of taxation; the people ought to be informed what they were to expect; and before Ministers were entitled to ask for supplies, they ought to pledge themselves that reductions should be made. The people of England had never manifested the least indisposition to grant proper supplies to the Crown; they had always been willing to give their money liberally when they thought it necessary; but when it was demanded for the purpose of supporting placemen and pensioners, or for building additional wings to Windsor Castle, they might justly desire, being themselves in distress, to keep it in their own pockets. The people of England had entertained hopes that the Ministers would have come down to the House and proposed some great reduction in taxation. It would have been a subject of great pleasure to all, that such an announcement had been made in the King's Speech; which might have administered some relief to the agonies of an impoverished people. A right hon. Gentleman said, that the country was suffering under a passing cloud; but it would be long before the condition of the people was materially improved. He was determined to support the cause of the people. He would support the people, not in their riotous conduct,—for that he should be the first to oppose and put down,—but in their constitutional and legal mode of demanding a reduction of their burthens; and the Ministry not only ought, but would find they must do something more than they had hitherto done, for the relief of the people. He heard with considerable surprise the hon. member for Callington declare, that the country was in an improving condition, and that the people were better off now than at any period since the Peace. He denied the truth of that statement, and maintained that the distress became greater every day. Ministers were bound to relieve the country, and he would require them to work day and night in their offices, until they found some remedy for the present evils. The House had a right to insist that some hope should be held out to the people, and that there was a prospect of speedy relief. The taxes hitherto repealed had not benefitted the great body of the people. No good had been done by the repeal of a paltry tax like the Leather-tax, for shoes and boots were dearer than ever. The people expected the repeal of the Assessed Taxes, which pressed heavily on them. The Ministers and all the pensioners of the State ought to follow the example of his Majesty, and of a noble Marquis, in giving up a portion of their salaries and pensions. If they did that, and repealed a number of taxes, they might regain the confidence of the nation.

The Resolution agreed to; the House resumed.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE (IRELAND). Mr. *Doherty* moved for leave to bring in a Bill for the more effectual Administration of Justice in Ireland. The object of the Bill would be, to extend to Ireland certain provisions of the Act for the more effectual Administration of Justice in England, which passed in the last Session of Parliament.

Mr. *O'Connell* did not rise to oppose the Motion, but as the Act referred to had made no effectual reform in the administration of justice in England, it must not be understood that the Bill proposed to be introduced, would effect any legal reform in Ireland. He would take this opportunity of noticing the manner of appointing Judges in Ireland. None but a man who had been much employed in the Courts could make a good Judge; but such offices had always been filled by political gentlemen,—he would not call them political adventurers,—who were thus rewarded for the services they had performed to Government in that House. This had been the case in the last appointment. The Ministers did not inquire who bore the best character in the Hall, but they came to this House, and having found a gentleman who always voted for them, they gave him the appointment. This was a proof of the want of a resident legislature in Ireland. Such an occurrence could not take place in this country, nor ought it to take place in any part of the kingdom; for the Judges made more law than the Parliament, and the appointment of such men should, therefore, be made with reference to their knowledge and ability only. He had no interest in speaking thus, for there was no appointment of the kind that he would accept if it were offered him now, and he had no hesitation in stating, that he never would accept any such appointment at any time.

Leave given.

POOR-LAWS.] Mr. *Weyland*, after observing, with respect to the law of settlement, that many cases had occurred at the Quarter Sessions, in which the Judges had decided the law contrary to the spirit in which he was sure that law was enacted, —after citing a case where the hiring of a house for 10*l.* a-year had been decided not to give a settlement, as the tenant did not remain in it for a year—moved for leave to bring in a Bill "to explain and amend the Act 6 Geo. 4th, c. 57, as far as regards the Settlement of the Poor, by the renting and occupation of tenements."

Leave given. Bill brought in and read a first time.

PATENT OF THE KING'S PRINTER.] Mr. *Hume* rose, pursuant to the notice he had given, to move for a copy of the King's Printer's Patent. In doing so, he regretted that the hon. member for Callington was not present, as, one fact being worth fifty arguments, he should be able to prove to that hon Member, that there were other motives which influenced Members in that House besides patriotism and the good of the country, by which alone he was sure that his hon. friend was influenced. He had greatly to complain of the conduct of Government in not redeeming its pledges as to economy. The Government had pledged themselves to effect every practicable economy in every department of the State, and he had to complain, that on the expiration of the patent to the King's Printer, they had not redeemed that pledge, by acting upon the recommendation of a former committee of that House. He had supposed, that the principle as to patents had been long since settled. He conceived that his Majesty had a right to grant patent privileges to certain individuals, for certain inventions or improvements, but he was of opinion that the King had no right to grant exclusive rights to individuals, by patent, to tax the people, without the consent of Parliament. He should, at a future period, when he intended to introduce the question of patents as regarded light-houses, &c., bring forward the whole question as to patents, so as to have it fully discussed and considered by a committee of that House. With regard to the present patent he had to state, that in 1799 Mr. Pitt granted the patent office of King's Printer to John Reeve, George Robert Eyre, and Andrew Strahan, for a period of thirty-one years. He (Mr. Hume) believed, that he should be able to show that this patent was granted to John Reeve, for the purpose of securing to him an income of 1,500*l.* a-year. Mr. Pitt understood that the clear profits of the office amounted to 3,000*l.* a-year, and it was stipulated that John Reeve should have the half of that during his life. Reports had been made by a committee of the House with regard to this office, to which he should have occasion to refer, and for which they were indebted to the hon. member for Dorsetshire. That hon. Member was chairman of a Select Committee in 1810, which inquired into the affairs of that, as well as of other offices connected with the Government; and the Report made by that committee contained much valuable information as to this office. The committee stated, with reference to the patent, that "the printing of Acts of Parliament and forms of prayer, stands on a different footing from the other printing, since Messrs. Eyre and Strahan have an exclusive right to the former until the year 1830, in virtue of a patent, granted in 1799, constituting them King's Printers, the former patent expiring at that period. The two English Universities have also a right to print the acts and forms of prayer, but they have not exercised it." He would not complain if an exclusive right had been granted to supply his Majesty with prayer-books, &c.; but what he complained of was, that an exclusive right was granted, to supply to the House of Commons and other places, to an amount that cost the public 36,000*l.* per annum. It appeared that in the year 1807, Reeve, conceiving that he did not get his fair share of the profits, filed a bill in Chancery, in which he alleged that the supply to Government alone amounted to 56,000*l.* and that the nett profits upon that single branch were 13,000*l.* The parties avoided the risk of exposure which would have attended litigation by coming to an accommodation, and the bill was accordingly withdrawn. So matters remained until the year 1810, when the hon. Member for Corfe Castle submitted to the House the propriety of instituting an inquiry into that and other public departments. That inquiry was made; and the Committee recommended the Government not to renew the patent of King's Printer, which recommendation, he was sorry to say, had not been attended to. The Committee said, in its ninth report, "Your Committee called for an account of work performed by Messrs. Eyre and Strahan, for the public, in the year 1808, and they find by the return made, that the expense of 'Acts, Bills, Reports, Accounts, Minutes of Evidence, and other papers' delivered in that year to the Lord Chancellor and the House of Peers, was 8,226*l.* 19*s.* 5*d.*; and the charge incurred for Acts of Parliament, delivered in the same year to the Magistrates of the United Kingdom and others, pursuant to an Address of the two Houses of Parliament, arising out of a recommendation of a Committee of the House of Commons, appointed to report upon the promulgation of the Statutes, was 16,975*l.* 13*s.* 9*d.* To these two sums several others are added—an account of Forms of Prayer for a general fast; of Acts, Proclamations, and other papers delivered to the Privy Council, to the Secretaries of State, and the Speaker of the House of Commons; and an account of local and personal Acts; making the total amount of this bill 36,137*l.* 3*s.* 5*d.* A further sum appears to have been paid in the same year to Messrs. Eyre and Strahan of 4,459*l.* 14*s.* 3*d.* for the Commissioners for Records, and of 1,369*l.* 0*s.* 4*d.* for the 35th volume of Journals of the House of Lords. Your Committee do not find that the bill of Messrs. Eyre and Strahan, any more than that of Mr. Hansard, is subjected to examination in respect to the reasonableness of the rate of charge." But the holders of this patent were not satisfied with the profits on the printing, for they considered themselves entitled to make an additional charge as booksellers. They thus made a very considerable profit on the sale of Acts of Parliament, and other things to which the privilege of their monopoly extended. The Committee went on to state that—"Messrs. Eyre and Strahan conceive that this patent constitutes them booksellers as well as printers to his Majesty, and entitles them to charge in both capacities for all the articles supplied under that patent; and they consequently make a much higher charge for Acts and Forms of Prayer than for Parliamentary Papers printed by them for the House of Lords. Their charges are 2½*d.* per copy for every sheet in the Public General Acts of Parliament, and 6*d.* for each copy of Forms of Prayer. If these charges had been reduced to the rate of their charge for the Parliamentary Papers for the House of Lords, the charge of 2½*d.* for Public General Acts would probably have been considerably below 1½*d.*, and the charge of 6*d.* for Forms of Prayer much below 4*d.*, and in this case a saving would have arisen exceeding 40 per cent in the price of the Public General Acts for 1808, and exceeding 33 per cent in the price of the Forms of Prayer." That committee stated then that a saving of 40 per cent might be effected in this particular department. He was sure if he were to try, that every sheet of Acts of Parliament, for which those parties charged 2½*d.*, he could get done by contract for ¾*d.* Let the House then only think what a loss the country had suffered from this patent office during the last thirty-one years. The work done in this office cost 150 per cent more than the same work done in the Stationery-office. The committee of 1810 condemned the principle of all patents for exclusive rights, for the sale of works, &c., as such patents partook of the evil of all commercial monopolies. The committee on that occasion pointed out the evils arising from the existence of this office, and it had ever since been the duty of his Majesty's Ministers to attend to their recommendations. It was said, that the Administration of the Duke of Wellington was saving and economical. He denied that it was so—he denied that there had been any saving in any of the public offices, except, indeed, in the instance of the office of Assistant-counsel to the Excise. When the individual holding that office died, the Duke of Wellington did not fill up the vacancy thus created, and that fact went the rounds of the papers for months afterwards. The hon. Member read from the report of the Select Committee, a statement of several items in the charges made by the King's printers,—one of which was—"for a general fast 997*l.*" The patent granted by Mr. Pitt expired in 1830. What he

(Mr. Hume) proposed to ask for was, that an abstract of the accounts of this office for each year, during that period, be laid before the House, in order that they might see the expenditure which had been incurred for it, and also that copies of the bill and answer which had been filed by one party against the other should be laid on the Table of the House, in order that they might be enabled to judge of the profits of this office. He had been taunted with a sordid economy; but it was not sordid economy to endeavour to cut down this and other such extravagant items of the public expenditure. One part of the contract by which this patent was held was, that one of the parties should sit in that House, and, of course, vote for the Ministers. Mr. Strahan did so for many years; and one of the King's printers, to whom the patent had been again granted, was returned at present to that House. He hoped that the patent had not been as yet renewed. An hon. Member told him that he saw it yesterday at the office in the Adelphi, where it must lie, and can be seen for a year, before it is enrolled. He therefore supposed that it had been granted. He must protest against the practice of granting exclusive profits to individuals, and of introducing them into that House to vote away the public money (he did not speak of the money granted to themselves, for which he did not so much care), and to add to the burthens of the people. It had been said, that more reductions could not be made, as the Government must be enabled to carry on the business of the country: by which he understood that Ministers must be enabled to command majorities in that House. The hon. member for Callington had talked of his using inflammatory language, but he only wished that that hon. Member were now present to hear him assert, as he did, that it was by such unhallowed, unconstitutional, and he might almost say illegal means, that Ministers commanded the influence which they possessed in that House. If that were inflammatory language, he trusted that it might reach to the remotest extremity of the country. He would maintain that the King's printers ought not to have the exclusive printing of any thing but for the King's private use alone, and that all the other work which was at present done in that office should be done by public contract. In the stationery-office they were capable of doing all that work, and ten times as much. A public contractor could only have the trifling profits between him and the next offer; but the King's printer was a contractor without a competitor. If Ministers could sanction such a patent, they did not deserve the confidence of the country, and ought not to remain in power for an hour. It would be seen whether the country would sanction such a proceeding. He, for one, protested against it, and if the patent had been renewed, he thought the House was bound, in the discharge of its duty, to bring to its bar the persons who had signed and sanctioned such a patent. He would not say, as the hon. Member to whom that patent was granted was not present, that it was on that account he voted for Ministers, but he never knew him vote against them. [*Hear, hear*, from Mr. Spottiswoode.] He saw that the hon. Member was present, and he would repeat his assertion, that he never knew him vote against Government. He then concluded by moving for returns of goods delivered and work performed by the King's printer for the last ten years, in detail, the object being to show the immense expense incurred by Government in printing public documents beyond what they could be printed for by contract in an open market.

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* said, that he had some reason to complain of the course which the hon. Member had thought proper to pursue. He had merely given notice of his intention to move for papers, and, instead of deferring his charges until the papers were produced, by which they might be refuted or substantiated, he had availed himself of his motion to put forth statements which at least ought to have been postponed. He would appeal to the House whether, before the documents moved for were produced, it was right for the hon. Member to discuss the propriety of granting the patent to the King's printer. Before the House could come to any conclusion upon the point, it must be in possession of the patent and other documents moved for. It was alleged that Mr. Pitt had appointed a gentleman to that office, and that he had kept up a scale of high charges in order to avail himself of the parliamentary services of him whom he had appointed; but was it fair to urge the same charge against those who now acted upon an opposite principle? An immense saving had been made to the public since the death of Mr. Pitt, and the only question now was, whether the patent should be given to a public officer, or the public should trust to chance the printing of its documents. This was a matter of pounds, shillings, and pence.

Mr. *Hume.*—Not quite so: it is likewise a matter of principle and of opinion.

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* continued.—The patent to the King's printer was connected with the privileges of the Universities, for upon both did the public depend, that neither in the laws of God nor in the laws of Parliament should any inaccuracy be found. The patent, moreover, gave to things printed by the King's printer an authority in the courts of justice. The Duke of Wellington had taken every opportunity of abolishing offices that were useless to the public; and to prove this he need but to apply to the Boards of Stamps, Customs, and Excise, in each of which recent commissions had not been filled up. By not filling up the place of Mr. Carr, the public had saved 5,000*l.* a year.

Mr. *Spottiswoode* said, that it had been asserted that he had made a contract to vote for Government in consideration of the advantages he derived from the patent. He denied the assertion, and defied any man to show such a contract: no man or set of men in that House had the right to command his vote, and if he differed from the opposite side of the House, that difference was not to be imputed to corruption. For his part he denied the charge. He did not fear the production of the patent, though he wished to hear from the legal Gentlemen in the House whether it was customary to produce the legal documents the hon. Member had called for.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that if the hon. Member was so willing to exculpate himself by producing the papers, he need not be so desirous of knowing what legal Gentlemen would say about the custom of affording documents to elucidate such a case. He would remind the hon. Gentleman, that in the Court of Chancery any man could get such papers, provided he could afford to pay for the stamps. It had not been asserted that the King's printer had entered into any contract to vote on all occasions for the Ministers: it had only been maintained that the chances were that the King's printer, as long as he possessed such a valuable patent, would always be found behind the Treasury bench, voting for the Government. This was only the doctrine of chances, and, as far as experience could trace, the doctrine had not proved fallacious. He denied what had fallen from the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to the authority given in Courts of law to what was printed by the King's printer, under the present system; for, whatever were the arrangements or terms, every thing printed under the royal patent would carry with it its authority. He very much doubted the prerogative of the Crown to grant any such monopoly, and if such a prerogative did exist, it ought to be exercised only in obedience to the opinions of the country.

Mr. *Maberly* thought the present a very inconvenient mode of discussing the Question. He objected to monopolies of all sorts, and he thought the present contract taken out of the common routine of contracts.

Mr. *Hume* complained that the right hon. Gentleman opposite (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had put in his mouth words which he had never uttered.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT PENSIONS.] Mr. *Hume* moved for returns of Pensions to widows of Officers of the Army, Navy and Civil service. He could not but confess himself averse to all public pensions, as they merely produced extravagance in individuals, and only effected results which might be attained by economy, and without burthening the public. A system of individual saving, to establish pension funds, had been commenced in private companies, and the contributions were from the salaries of the clerks. From this day forward, he would maintain, that no man, unless he was injured in the public service, ought to be entitled to a pension. He wished to get out of the present vicious principle entirely; for until pensions for one class, and poor-rates to provide for another, were got rid of, it was hopeless to expect that the country would have either a body of independent gentlemen or a body of independent peasantry. The poor of Scotland were many degrees better than those of England, for they depended upon their own exertions and upon the feelings of their neighbours, and not upon the right to parochial relief. In the same manner he believed that the middle classes would be better if they had neither pensions nor bounties to look for.

Mr. *Leader* thought that the system of making retrenchments by turning poor clerks out of office was one of great cruelty.

Lord *F. L. Gower* maintained, that the widows' pensions were now governed upon a principle which could not encourage any extravagance in officers.

Mr. *Warburton* thought, that the widows of common soldiers ought to be entitled to pensions, and he denied that there was any wish on that side of the House to reduce the widows of officers and of common soldiers to the same level.

Mr. *Hume* complained, that the rich man's wife now had a pension, and the poor man's had none. The soldier and sailor, the real nerve and arm of war, had no claim to this bounty, whilst others had.

Lord *F. L. Gower* denied the correctness of the last observation of the hon. member for Middlesex.

Motion agreed to.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, Nov. 8.

Minutes.] Petitions presented. For the abolition of Slavery, by Earl Grosvenor, from Wiltshire:—By the Duke of Gloucester, from Winterslow, Malton, and four other places:—By the Earl of Eldon, from two Congregations of Wesleyans in Newcastle-on-Tyne:—By the Earl of Chichester, from Hastings, and another place in Sussex:—By Lord Cawdor, from the Wesleyans of Pembrokeshire:—By the Bishop of London, from Chester, and various other places:—By the Bishop of Winchester, from Warminster, and several places in Wiltshire:—By Lord Wharncliffe, from the Independent Congregations of Wortley, near Leeds, of Dent, of Huddersfield, and nineteen other places in Yorkshire.

Lord Tenterden laid on the Table five Bills; viz. a Bill to regulate the method of taking Arbitrations: a Bill to enable Courts of Law to order the Examination of Witnesses: a Bill to improve the proceedings in Prohibition and Writs of Mandamus: a Bill to enable Courts of Law to give relief, &c.: and a Bill for the more speedy judgment and execution in Actions brought at Westminster, which he had framed in compliance with recommendations contained in the second Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the state of the Common Law.

The Earl of Eldon laid on the Table a Bill to amend the Bankrupt Laws.

Belgium.] The Marquis of *Lansdown* said, he rose, in pursuance of notice given by him the other evening, to move for a Copy of a Document which he thought might by some possibility throw further light on the connection of this country with Belgium. In the preamble to the treaty, signed by the Plenipotentiaries of the great Powers, parties to the formation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, he found reference made to a Protocol of a conference held previously on this subject, which Protocol contained the stipulations and conditions on which the Prince of Orange accepted the Sovereignty of Belgium and Holland, and which Protocol is there stated to have been delivered by the Earl of Clancarty to the accredited agent of the Prince, before the signing of the treaty. This protocol was not to be found among the papers laid upon the Table of the House; and although it might not contain anything of importance, yet he thought that at such a moment as the present, Parliament and the country should be fully satisfied that there was no obligation or anything that could imply obligation for Great Britain to interfere in the affairs of Belgium appearing on the face of any of the treaties connected with the formation of the kingdom of the Netherlands. He had examined with great satisfaction the treaty laid on their Lordships' Table, with reference to that subject, and he had heard with still greater satisfaction, that on the terms of that treaty rested the whole of the question of interference, because he could not find in the whole of it the shadow of a shade of anything which could impose on us the duty of interfering in any manner whatever in the affairs of the Netherlands, or of guaranteeing any particular form of Government in that country. If, then, there were no duties imposed by treaties, he thought that no consideration of interest or of expediency could possibly arise which would justify or induce this country to adopt any other course than that of total abstinence from all interference. He did not say this because he was indifferent to the condition of Belgium, or because he thought the situation of that country might not have a material effect on the peace of Europe. He felt that the peace of Europe depended much on the permanent character of the Government, and the security of the institutions, under which the inhabitants of Belgium might ultimately place themselves. The necessity, however, of abstaining from interference in the arrangements of the people of France—a people who had shown a moderation in the hour of victory, and a disinterestedness in their whole conduct, which made them a fit example for the world. The necessity of leaving them to uphold the institutions of their choice had been fully acknowledged; and it was because he felt the same necessity with respect to the Belgians, that he thought the perfect settlement of the affairs of both the one and the other would be best forwarded by abstinence on the part of this country from the appearance of all intervention, even by way of advice, unless it was required by the people of that country themselves. It was for this reason that he saw with regret opinions expressed in the Speech from the Throne, on the subject of the good government of Belgium—a government with which this country had nothing to do, excepting so far as it might be necessary to provide, during its changes, for the security of our own. He must, therefore, repeat his desire to ascertain from the Protocol, whether there was anything in it binding England to interference beyond the terms of the treaty. He knew there was a guarantee for the integrity of certain parts of the Prussian provinces—whether fortunately or unfortunately for this country, he would not then inquire; but, with respect to Belgium, he thought the public mind could not be too fully satisfied.

The Earl of *Aberdeen* had no objection to produce the document which the noble Marquis required, but he felt it necessary to repeat his assertion, that neither in it nor in any other was there to be found any arrangement or obligation different from that which was to be found expressed in the eight articles of the treaty of Vienna. He would not enter into the question of interference as commented on by the noble Marquis, except for the purpose of observing, that the Government contemplated no interference at the present moment but an amicable one, although he did not put such a construction on the treaty as to say that no events could take place which would warrant the intervention of England. The interests of this country were at all times so intimately connected with those of the Netherlands, that it was impossible for the Government to look with indifference at the situation in which they were placed. He had already stated, most distinctly, that the object of all interferences on the part of England were amicable, and such as might be expected from a State situated as it was with regard to the Netherlands; and he now repeated, that no other description of interference was contemplated.

The Marquis of *Londonderry*, having differed from the noble Earl (Earl Aberdeen) during the greater part of the last Session, thought it but justice to him now to declare, that he cordially approved of the determination which that noble Lord evinced to preserve the faith of the treaties to which we were pledged. He had heard with great pain the eulogium pronounced by the noble Marquis on the revolution of France. Did the noble Marquis blind himself to the fact that that revolution was only commencing, and that it might ere long inundate Europe with blood? How noble Lords could come down to the House, and pronounce eulogiums on such a state of things, he was at a loss to conceive. If his information was correct, the Chamber of Deputies of that country had annihilated one-half of the Chamber of Peers, and when the Government appointed by it showed a disposition to extend mercy to persons who had been perhaps misguided, or had mis-ruled, it was told that the mob would not allow the National Guard to do their duty, and that that Guard would open their ranks, and let the mob pass, sooner than see mercy extended to the prisoners. He (Lord Londonderry) thought there was blood behind the revolution, and if it extended to Belgium, what, then, would become of the peace of Europe. He was convinced that the policy of this country was, to preserve a decided and cordial Union with those Allies who had for twenty years been united with us in our struggles to obtain peace, and he was convinced that by the preservation of that Union they might bid defiance to all the mischief which threatened them abroad. Looking at the affairs at home, he confessed himself a coward, for he looked with fearful apprehension at the signs of the times. It was the duty of that House, however, to stand by the Throne and the Executive, and if the noble Earl opposite (Earl Grey), for whose talents he had all his life preserved the highest admiration—if that noble Lord and the aristocracy would stand by the Throne, the opinions of the fomenters of mischief would soon cease to make themselves heard, and their power moulder into dust. A noble Earl (Lord Winchilsea) had the other evening spoken of the party of which he was the organ.

The Duke of *Richmond* rose to order. The noble Marquis was alluding to the statements of a noble Lord not present, and had mistaken he believed the expression of the noble Earl

The Marquis of *Londonderry* admitted he was wrong in alluding to the noble Earl in his absence; but he would merely say now, that the noble Earl had no right to claim for himself, or his party, the name of being real Tories. The real Tories of the country were the supporters of Government. And the noble Earl's (Winchilsea's) party had no better title to that name than any other noble Lords. He (Lord Londonderry) had said more than he meant to say; but his feelings carried him away. It was impossible not to feel excited on such a subject, and he hoped that those who really have property, and who have interests at stake in the country, will stand by the Government in the crisis in which it is placed.

The Duke of *Richmond* did not think it necessary to say much in reply to the noble Marquis, after he had admitted, that his feelings carried him away; but he confessed, that he could not avoid pointing out the unjustifiable course the noble Marquis was pursuing in alluding to the opinions of the noble Earl in his absence, opinions which would not bear the construction put on them by the noble Marquis; for he, the noble Earl, alluded to, had merely spoken of his opinions as those of an individual. He had also felt it necessary to interrupt the noble Marquis, because he was adopting the unparliamentary course of alluding to what passed in the debate on a former occasion. Perceiving how firm an adherent and supporter of the Government the noble Marquis had proved himself that night, and recollecting the eloquence he had displayed throughout the whole of last Session against the same Government, on the subject of the boundaries of Greece, he (the Duke of Richmond) would say, with perfect courtesy, to the noble Marquis, that he should not have thought it worth his while to reply to the speech he had just heard, was it not that the noble Marquis had thought proper to call on all those who really possessed property to rally round the Throne and the Government. He must say, in answer to that call, that the Government, to deserve support, should take care, by its acts and expressions, to raise no needless alarm among the people of England. He believed, when the hour of danger came, that the people would rally round the Throne; but he would say also, that the only way for the Throne and the Government to make that rally perfectly secure, was to form a Government which really possessed the confidence of the country. It was not by writing letters to Lord Mayors, declaring that there was danger in his Majesty's going to dine with the citizens of London; it was not by raising unnecessary apprehensions that the confidence of the people was to be secured. The alarm consequent upon the writing of that letter, unless it could be explained by something which had not yet been stated, would extend to the remotest corner of the kingdom; but he felt confident, notwithstanding, that the King would reign in the hearts of his people; and he would stake his property and his life—he would stake his character and his very existence—that the Sovereign might go if he pleased into the heart of his City of London without the assistance of police or the protection of guards, and be borne along amidst the joyous cheers of a loving and delighted people. As to the distinction taken by the noble Marquis between the name of Whig and Tory, he knew of none such in that House, but he did know, that every honest man would rally round those whom they found best calculated to support the interest of the people, and to uphold the dignity of the Throne. He would say one word before he sat down, on the subject of a Reform in Parliament, which had been alluded to by the noble Earl (Grosvenor). He was no friend to a radical change in the system of Representation, but he thought some change necessary in the existing state of opinions; and although he would not then state to what extent he thought that change ought to go, he promised to give any proposition on that subject which might be brought before the House his best attention. He would be one of the last to yield to the clamours of the mob; but he agreed with those who thought that some reform was necessary, and he was prepared to concede the demands of the people. The noble Duke concluded by expressing a hope that the noble Marquis would come better prepared next time he felt it necessary to read the House a lesson.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* repeated his regret, that he had alluded to the noble Earl in his absence; and he thought the noble Duke ought to consider that sufficient.

The Duke of *Wellington*;—Before I proceed to address myself to the subject before the House, I feel it necessary to say, that I am under great obligations to the noble Duke for putting it in my power to explain the circumstances of the letter to which he has alluded. Before I begin, however, I wish to state, that I concur in the opinion delivered by the noble Duke, that his Majesty is the most popular Sovereign that ever reigned in this country; and, still more, that he is a Sovereign whose public and private conduct most deserves the popularity which he has obtained. The letter, however, which was last night written by the Secretary of State, by command of his Majesty, to the Lord Mayor, was not in any manner connected with that popularity; for his Majesty had never the slightest doubt of the attachment and loyalty of all the respectable portion of the citizens and inhabitants of the metropolis. I must begin, however, first of all, by putting your Lordships in possession of a letter relating to myself, which I received the day before yesterday, from the gentleman holding the situation of Lord Mayor Elect for the City of London. That letter is as follows:—

> "From the station of Lord Mayor, to which I have been elected, numberless communications are made to me, both personally and by letter, in reference to the 9th, and it is on that account I take the liberty of addressing your Grace. Although the feelings of all the respectable citizens of London are decidedly loyal, yet it cannot but be known there are, both in London as well as the country, a set of desperate and abandoned characters who are anxious to avail themselves of any circumstance to create tumult and confusion, while all of any respectability in the City are vying with each other to testify their loyalty on the occasion. From what I learn, it is the intention of some of the desperate characters alluded to, to take the opportunity of making an attack on your Grace's person on your approach to the Hall. Every exertion on my part shall be used to make the best possible arrangement in the City; but should any sudden and violent attack be made in one quarter, any civil force alone might not be sufficiently effectual, and I should not be doing my duty, after what I have heard, did I not take the liberty of suggesting to your Grace the propriety of your coming strongly and sufficiently guarded. I probably may be considered giving you needless trouble, but the respect which I, as well as every person who really wishes the welfare of the country, must have for your Grace, and the gratitude we owe you, has induced me to adopt this course."

Hence, although I felt myself personally to be placed under the same protection of the laws as any other subject in the kingdom, I did not think that I was justified in making confusion and tumult in the procession which was to attend his Majesty, by adopting the advice of the writer of this letter, and seeking protection from the civil and military power in such a way as would be likely to produce that very disturbance which all men were so anxious to avoid. Under these circumstances, when I received the letter I have referred to, I felt it my duty to refrain from attending at the City feast. My Lords, I communicated this determination to my colleagues, and we concluded on that occasion, from that letter, from other letters which I had received, and from letters received by my right hon. friend, the Secretary of State, on the same subject, that it was very possible that a tumult would occur in the City on the occasion of his Majesty's visit; and we thought it our duty to recommend his Majesty to postpone his visit. And we were induced to come to this determination in consequence of all the information we received of various descriptions. We have no doubt whatever, from the information conveyed to us from a variety of quarters—information on which we could rely—that an attack would be made on the police—that there was a plan laid to extinguish the lights, and that a variety of attempts would be made to excite riot and disorder. My Lords, we had no doubt that we should know how to suppress those tumults; but I must say that I considered it far preferable not to hazard the risk of riot and confusion occurring in the presence of the Sovereign, and we therefore recommended the Sovereign not to put himself in a situation to be the witness of such tumults. My Lords, it was solely on this view that we recommended his Majesty to postpone his visit, as I conceive it impossible that such confusion and tumult should exist, without ending in bloodshed. The people, my Lords, would be collected together to witness a pageant—the pageant of his Majesty going in state to visit the Corporation of the City of London, and confer on the Lord Mayor the honour of dining with him. His Majesty and his Ministers, the great Officers of State, and the foreign Ambassadors, could not go to the City of London without causing a great collection of people, and making it very probable that riot and confusion would take place. I say, my Lords, that there was a great chance—and a very great chance—that there would arise serious consequences to his Majesty's subjects, and therefore we recommended his Majesty not to go. The noble Duke (Richmond) has asked if the news of disorder and tumult was confined to the City of London, and if there were apprehensions of riot in other places? There were not. It was sufficient for me to know that there were such apprehensions in the City. With some parts of the country, other noble Lords must be better acquainted than I am. The noble Duke himself must know more than I do, as to the disposition of the people in Sussex. In Surrey and one or two other counties, as is known to your Lordships, there have been some disorders; there has been some stoppage of work in Lancashire, but I know nothing beyond these to disturb the national tranquillity at this moment. At the same time I cannot doubt the truth of the information communicated by the Lord Mayor Elect, namely, that there would have been confusion and tumult in the City had the pageant taken place. After having said so much, I shall only add that I have no objection whatever to produce the document asked for by the noble Marquis; and I can assure your Lordships, that there is no inclination in the Government of the country, or any other government that I am acquainted with, to do anything which is likely to disturb the peace of Europe.

The Earl of *Shrewsbury* stated, that he conceived the present times were full of danger; and he saw no better means of meeting those dangers than for their Lordships cordially to unite among themselves and promote the great cause of reform. Unless that were promoted, and unless something were done to meet the wishes of the people, he doubted whether they would support the Government. He was happy to observe that the unpopularity which was provoking riots was only that of the Administration, and it was, in his opinion, a great misfortune that the affairs of the country were administered—by a great man certainly, but a man who was only great as a soldier. The people were sensible of the generous character of the Sovereign, but that did not extend its influence to the Administration. It was clear from what had been just stated by the noble Duke, that the present was not a time to trifle with the feelings of the people; or to administer the Government, which ought to be administered for the benefit of all, for the benefit of a few. Ministers seemed, indeed, to have no other object in view than to perpetuate their own power. This was, however, no time to trifle with the people. They ought to give way to some more vigorous Statesmen, who would find some more efficacious mode of relieving the people, than taking off taxes that amounted to one farthing a head; and unless some more effectual relief were given them—unless there was a large reduction of expenditure—unless the people were restored to their just share in the management of their own concerns, of which the revolutions of time had deprived them—unless the Government did ample justice to the people, it would not secure, or rather would not regain the confidence of the people, and would never be able to establish the prosperity of the country on a solid foundation. Much had been said about agitators and reformers, and much obloquy had been cast on an individual who was a distinguished agitator and reformer; but on that subject he entertained an opinion, he was afraid, very different from most of their Lordships. The noble Earl then pronounced a spirited eulogium on Mr. O'Connell, whose agitation had crowned the cause of religious liberty with its latest and its greatest triumph; and whose great and commanding genius had restored calm to an irritated nation, and brought an infuriated multitude to listen to the dictates of reason, and obey the voice of the understanding. He concluded by declaring that the Union between England and Ireland had degraded the latter to a province, and that there could be no hope that she would enjoy permanent tranquillity till she possessed a resident gentry, who spent their rents in the country, and cultivated with their people the relations of kindness and affection.

The Marquis of *Clanricarde* meant to address the few observations he should offer to the House, exclusively to the extraordinary conduct of his Majesty's Ministers in the advice they had given. He had heard the explanation of the noble Duke with the greatest horror. The noble Duke said, he had waited with the greatest impatience for an opportunity to justify himself; and he hoped that the noble Duke would have been able to do away with the panic which he had caused, and the terror which he had inspired, and restore that property which confidence in him had destroyed. What had he done? He had advised his Majesty not to trust himself in public among his subjects. He had thrown a slur on the City of London—he had thrown a slur on the nation—and he had thrown a slur on the good name of his Majesty. These were the consequences of his conduct. He had caused a loss of property, also, to a considerable amount. The funds had fallen three per cent that day, which had caused a serious loss of property to some persons; and if the noble Duke was determined to retain power at all hazards, he did not believe that the fundholders would ever recover their losses. And what, he would ask, was the excuse for all this? The noble Duke, forsooth, was unpopular. Was that news first known on Saturday? Was there a man amongst their Lordships who did not know that before? Had not the noble Duke received painful evidence of that for some time? The pageant, it was said, would collect a great crowd; but what would be said if it did not? If it were only an ordinary dinner—if no shops were shut—if the people were not to assemble to do honour to the Sovereign—if there were no crowd—would not that be a slight to the Sovereign? But how was it that all these hazards were not known before? Was it that the noble Duke had no information concerning the state of the people, and was he now, as he was last Session, completely ignorant of all the circumstances which caused excitement in the country? After all, he had heard of nothing to deter his Majesty from going to the City, except the attempt on the noble Duke. That was a good reason for the noble Duke not going to the City of London. Against such an attempt nobody would more seriously contend than he would—honouring the Duke as he did, as a military man, though as a Minister he should always oppose him; but to the Government and to the country his conduct was equally detrimental There was, perhaps, no person who would not suffer in some degree from the alarm sounded by the noble Duke. The news would be spread to distant parts that something serious had happened in London. It was known that a large military force had been drawn round London, and with that knowledge the communication made to the City of London would have gone forth to the country without one word of explanation. It would be sent through the whole country, that the King did not dare trust himself in the City of London. He believed that the King might go in safety to every part of the City like one of the common people, and without the least chance of being insulted. Of this strange proceeding the noble Duke had given no better explanation than was afforded by the letter he had received from the Lord Mayor. His conduct must lower the Administration in the eyes of the country, and show that in minute matters of detail, as well as in the more comprehensive duties of Government, his Majesty's present Ministers wanted capacity to administer the affairs of the country.

Earl *Grey* addressed their Lordships somewhat as follows:—I understand, my Lords, with satisfaction, from the answer of the noble Earl (Aberdeen), that the protocol contains no sensible variations from the general treaty, or the particular conditions. So far every thing is satisfactory. The noble Earl, too, has signified his intention of laying the protocol before your Lordships, which will be of some interest to this part of the subject. I cannot, however, refrain from saying, after hearing what I have this night heard, relative to those treaties, that what fell from the noble Duke on a former occasion gave me considerable surprise, and I must repeat the conviction which I formerly mentioned—a conviction which my noble friend has already expressed much better than I can—a conviction, my Lords, that by those treaties no obligation whatever is imposed on the country; we have contracted no engagement whatever to interfere with the internal affairs of the government of the Netherlands. All interference on that subject is left by these treaties to be determined by the usual considerations, and by what of policy and expediency is due to an independent nation. We are not bound to interfere by any obligation whatever. If we are not so bound, I repeat, my Lords, with my noble friend, that, in my opinion, sound policy, justice, and respect for the independence of other people, as well as regard for the interest of this country, enjoin us on the present occasion not to interfere with the internal affairs of Belgium. As this is my opinion, I cannot avoid feeling surprise at what was stated by the noble Earl, that the Government only contemplated amicable interference, such as would be beneficial to the Low Countries, and conducive to the interests of Great Britain; for that interference, in times like the present, is contrary to the policy usually pursued by this country, must be pernicious to its interests, and can only lead to the most dangerous results. Having said this, I must refer to what has been said by my noble friend (the Marquis of Londonderry)—if he will allow me to call him so, and to whom, at least, I must express my gratitude for the kind manner in which he spoke of me; but from what the noble Marquis said, he seems to think that I am friendly and favorable to revolutions, and disposed to encourage them. I certainly did, my Lords, express my approbation of the conduct of the French people on a former occasion, but, if it is necessary to recall to your Lordships' recollection what fell from so humble an individual as myself, I took care to state, that all revolutions were in themselves bad, and could only be justified by a serious and plain necessity; but if they are necessary, my Lords, I, for one, think we ought not to be deterred from making a revolution, if without that we cannot maintain or preserve our liberties. I approve of the late French revolution, because I think it was necessary, by the fatal attempt of the government to interfere with the liberties of the people—I say, a fatal attempt, my Lords, which, in their situation, left the French people no other chance but that of absolute submission or open resistance. On this principle I approve of the French revolution, admiring the great courage of the people in achieving the victory, and their great generosity after the contest was over. I hope that the Ministers will agree with me, and as they have showed respect to the government of France, that they will show respect to the people of Belgium, by which alone I think they will ensure the peace of this country, and the peace of Europe. So much, my Lords, with reference to what occurred in the early part of the evening; and I now pass to a subject of more immediate importance—of more interest to the House, and one on which its attention has been lately fixed. I must say, that when I first read the letter this morning which appeared in the public prints—I must own that I felt something like humiliation—I felt the fullest regret and disappointment that such a letter was thought necessary by the Government, being persuaded that it would not issue such a letter without first making inquiries, and obtaining information that the letter was necessary. Is this a moment to circulate accounts of public dangers unnecessarily? The noble Duke will, I am sure, concur with me, that such reports much increase the difficulties under which the country labours. We are engaged at present in difficult, and even doubtful negotiations abroad, and such scenes will not contribute to their success. They are not likely to make foreign Powers respect the British Ministry. Such a state of things will not excite respect for the country abroad, or persuade foreign Powers that the Ministry are better able to fulfil their engagements than when they expect to be supported by a loyal people. I felt something like humiliation, something like disappointment and regret, when I saw the announcement, though I knew nothing of the circumstances, of which I felt assured the Ministers were aware, or they would never recommend such an important step. I felt assured that they must possess some information of which I knew nothing. Under all these painful feelings, I found one topic of consolation in its being avowed and declared, that this measure was not in any manner necessary to provide for the safety of his Majesty. I feel assured, as a noble Lord expressed himself on a former occasion, that if ever a Monarch was firmly seated in the hearts of his people, it is the Sovereign who at present sits on the Throne of these realms. For him, personally, there was no apprehension of danger; and for him, it was stated by the noble Duke, that no apprehension was felt. The noble Duke has stated, however, on the authority of the letter from the Lord Mayor elect, that there was some danger of an attack on the person of the noble Duke. I abhor all such attacks; and were I the political enemy of the noble Duke, which I am not, I should readily place myself in any situation in which my services could defend the noble Duke from any such attacks, which I consider as un-English in their character, as they are unmanly and ungenerous. I deprecate all such attacks, and I see with regret any such feelings arise in his Majesty's subjects. From the threats against the noble Duke, I think he took a wise resolution in abstaining from filling his place at the ceremony. The danger of the noble Duke is, however, the prominent feature of the Lord Mayor's letter; it contains no proof of any danger which ought to have prevented his Majesty from attending in the City. Some other apprehensions are referred to—it is loosely stated that placards, threatening riots, had been exhibited; that the police was to be attacked; that some ill-affected persons were prepared to make confusion; and that at night there was a great probability that they would make tumults and disorders. My Lords, I say all this is very loose, for at what time does a great town like this metropolis not contain among the mass of its inhabitants many evil-disposed spirits, and to whom large assemblages of the people will not give an opportunity of committing many evil acts, and creating riot and disorder? If the noble Duke waits till there is no danger of any riots occurring, his Majesty will never be able to show himself to his admiring people, for there can never be a considerable number of the people assembled on any public occasion when his Majesty may not be exposed to similar riots. Nothing, therefore, is, I think, more unsatisfactory than the noble Duke's explanation. If such a communication as that letter were sent to me, I should make it my first business to inquire into all the circumstances of the case, and I should not rely implicitly on the statement of any Lord Mayor. My Lords, we have seen on a former occasion a Lord Mayor, who claimed a great reputation for his temerity, but whose principal failing was, I believe, his timidity, who made false representations under its influence, relative to the riots of 1780, and who was, I believe, prosecuted for that in a Court of Justice. Remembering this, my Lords, and knowing nothing of the character of the Lord Mayor elect, who may be inclined to magnify dangers, and possibly anticipate a disturbance without any good reason, I should have made a diligent inquiry into all the circumstances on which he founded his opinion. I took it for granted that the noble Duke must have made such inquiries, that he was convinced the Lord Mayor had not seen objects in a false light; and that he was satisfied, from the information he had received, that there was no other way to avoid danger than the advice he had given to his Majesty. If this were the case, I could make no objection to his conduct. On this subject I have not much information; but since I came into the House I have heard something of the proceedings of the Court of Aldermen, which makes me inclined to think that the circumstances of the case have not received due consideration. The Court of Aldermen has examined the subject, and has come to the resolution, that every precaution had been taken—that there was no cause to apprehend any real danger to his Majesty, and that the Lord Mayor was not authorised to make the communication he had made to his Majesty's Government. This information has been derived from authority, and has been delivered from the Court of Aldermen in another place. Under such circumstances, I think the advice which has been given to his Majesty is not justified. I could not help saying this, but more than this I will not say. I repeat, that the advice given to the Crown was not authorised by a sound judgment. I am consoled by reflecting, that the unpopularity mentioned does not affect the Sovereign, but only the noble Duke. The existence of that feeling is not unaccountable; but any overt acts resulting from it I shall always discountenance. For the rest, my Lords, I see no foundation for any extreme alarm as to the situation of the country, and nothing to make me regard our domestic peace as likely to be interrupted.

The Duke of *Wellington*, in explanation, was understood to apologize for not having gone further into the subject. He had, however, referred to other letters besides that from the Lord Mayor. Their Lordships would recollect, that in the letter of the Lord Mayor it was stated that he could not depend on the civil power for preserving peace, though all proper measures had been adopted. The information he had received from a variety of quarters convinced him that it was intended to attack the police. He had been asked if his Majesty could not proceed to every part of the town without being protected by the police? His Majesty certainly could; but in this case his Majesty was not to proceed alone. There was to be a procession, which required that the streets should be kept clear for fourteen or sixteen hours out of the twenty-four. A great number of persons would be collected in one spot, and if an attack were made on the police, it would be necessary, for the safety of their lives, to call in the interference of the military. He wished to ask if the Government ought not to take such measures of precaution? Was it fit, he would also ask, when his Majesty went to visit the Lord Mayor, that there should be a battle in the streets among those who came to witness the pageant? He had letters in his pocket, and a hand-bill calling on the seamen to collect, to the number of 3,000 or 4,000, and present a petition to his Majesty. He had received a variety of accounts from persons in different situations, that riots were to be apprehended, which were sufficient to make the Government hesitate, even before he received the letter from the Lord Mayor. He would even go further, and tell their Lordships, that the gentleman who was now Lord Mayor, and about to go out of office, told him yesterday, it would be absolutely necessary that the escort of honour which accompanied his Majesty should remain in the neighbourhood of Guildhall or the Mansion-house. When the consequences to the City of London were contemplated, —when bloodshed was likely to ensue—when it was remembered, which was an important feature of the case, that these people would be brought together by his Majesty and his Ministers, and the Corporation of London, was it to be borne that they should be the cause of riots, disorder, and loss of life? He must, therefore, say, that he was never more satisfied that he had done his duty than when he gave the advice to his Majesty not to go into the City. He was not alarmed for any danger likely to happen to his Majesty; and any danger to which he himself might be exposed was nothing to the possible consequences which might happen to the people, and therefore he conceived that the advice he had given was likely to be most beneficial.

The Earl of *Radnor* found the second explanation of the noble Duke not more satisfactory than the first. Unless the Government had previously made inquiries (and it did not seem that the Government had made inquiries), he did not see how it could advise his Majesty to come to such a determination. The noble Duke said, he had received anonymous letters; but he had not informed their Lordships that he made any inquiries into the truth of their contents. It appeared that the Court of Aldermen, which had made inquiries, had come to a different conclusion from that adopted by the noble Duke. The consequences of such a step as that recommended by the noble Duke ought to have been well considered. In London the alarm was only casual, and might soon cease; but the conduct of the Government would generate alarm through the whole country, which would not cease for several days. The letter sent to the Lord Mayor had then been travelling sixteen hours, at the rapid rate at which coaches now travel, without one word of explanation accompanying it. Could that do otherwise than create confusion and alarm throughout the country? It was said there was dissatisfaction in some parts of the country; would not that be encouraged? There was agitation in Ireland; would not that receive fresh life from such a communication? The noble Duke could not possibly have seen the danger of his proceedings, or he would have taken some pains to set the letter in its proper light? Suppose that, upon mature investigation, it should be found that the noble Duke's anticipations were not correct, would he not be sorry for his advice? It ought to be followed up, for, if the information were correct, there was a great deal of dissatisfaction in the country. If the noble Duke's information were correct, there must be a rebellion raging in the country. Four thousand special constables were ready to be sworn in to preserve the peace, and if that force were not sufficient to control the disaffected, they must be numerous. If the noble Duke had followed the investigation of these facts, he must have obtained some certain information. He was astonished that 4,000 special constables were considered not sufficient to keep the peace. This astonishment was only increased by the conduct of the noble Duke and his colleagues. He supposed they must have some information: he gave them credit for having that information, and argued that they could not be guilty of so much rashness as to act as they had done without such information, and that they were convinced, after their investigations, that it was not possible to preserve the peace. The City of London might demand, in the first instance, on what ground such a charge was made against it. Their Lordships might next require that some means should be instantly adopted to restore peace and tranquillity, and to give satisfaction to the public mind. He could not help thinking, that if the Ministers advised his Majesty to abstain from going to the Lord Mayor's dinner on no other information than that which appeared in this discussion, the proceeding looked very much like a betrayal of their trust.

The Marquis of *Bute* said, the language used, and the opinions expressed by some of the noble Lords on the other side, were certainly very different from what he was accustomed to hear from them when they sat on his (the Ministerial) side of the House, and he had the honour of calling them his noble friends. They said, in substance, that the reasons of the noble Duke for the advice which he gave to his Majesty to abstain from giving occasion to tumult and disturbance, was far from being well grounded or justified by the circumstances. He would not take up the time of the House in recapitulating the reasons of the noble Duke, as he himself had so well stated them; but the whole might be comprised in a sentence. The reason assigned by the noble Duke was, that he saw in the circumstance of his Majesty's joining the City procession, a risk of disturbance, of riot, and of confusion—a risk to property—and a risk of bloodshed. He knew no man better able than the noble Duke to appreciate such a risk, or more able effectually to guard against it, if strong measures should be necessary for that purpose. But he highly approved and commended the course which the noble Duke had deemed it prudent to adopt on this occasion. He had heard some, or at least one, of the noble Lords opposite lay great weight on what he called the unpopularity of the noble Duke. He was not on terms of very great intimacy or confidence with the noble Lord, and therefore might not be aware of all the reasons which the noble Lord might have for his conclusion, that the noble Duke was unpopular. But what was the unpopularity? That it had gone to a very considerable extent he could scarcely believe, because it was not very long since he had heard the contrary with his own ears. He would ask, who could be more popular than the noble Duke, a few months ago, during the review of the troops in Hyde Park? But, at all events, as to any popularity worth having, that popularity would attend the man who, although he had no personal fear, yet did what he conscientiously considered to be his duty to his country and his Sovereign, at the risk of losing, for the moment, popularity of another description. The noble Duke's advice to his Majesty was, not to do that which would be attended with the imminent risk of shedding the blood of his subjects; and, in doing so, he showed a proper sense of duty, both to the Sovereign and to his subjects; and by this course of conduct, whatever popularity the noble Duke might lose for the moment, he would gain a much better and a longer popularity. Those who had had a large experience in such matters could best appreciate the value of blood, and the noble Duke, by his aversion to run any risk that could be avoided of shedding the blood of citizens, had proved that he was actuated by the best feelings of human nature. It had been said, that the noble Duke acted on the letter of the Lord Mayor Elect. But that was not correct; for the noble Duke had distinctly stated, that he had proceeded upon information from other sources, into which the Ministers had inquired, and had reason to conclude that it was correct. Under all these circumstances, he thought they had acted wisely in giving his Majesty the advice which they did. As to the other topics which had come under discussion that night, he would merely say, that there was not any intention to interfere with the affairs of the Netherlands, except by amicable mediation, and the explanation of the noble Duke on that head was perfectly satisfactory.

The Motion of the Marquis of Lansdown, "That a Copy of the Protocol of 1814, relative to the Union of Belgium and Holland under the Sovereignty of the King of the Netherlands, should be laid on their Lordships' Table," was agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, Nov. 8.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. Complaining of undue Returns for Drogheda, Cork, Taunton, and Ilchester. By Mr. DENISON, from Clapham, against extending the Metropolitan Police Act to that district. By Mr. PHIPPS, from the Ship-owners of Scarborough, against the Duty on Coals carried coastwise. For the abolition of Slavery, by Mr. BLAIR, from Glasgow:—By Mr. HODGSON, from Newcastle-upon-Tyne:—By Lord STANLEY, from Blackburn, Bolton, Backford, and five other places in Lancashire:—By Sir WM. INGLEBY, from Brinckley:—By Sir R. PRICE, from Dissenters at Kingston, Ross, and Huntingdon:—By Mr. SANDFORD, from several places in Somersetshire:—By Mr. BELL, from several places in Northumberland:—By Lord ALTHORP, from several places in Northamptonshire. By the same noble Lord, from General William Thornton, objecting to the King's being called upon, on his accession to the Throne, to make a Declaration against Transubstantiation.

ABSENCE OF MINISTERS.] Mr. *Brougham* took the opportunity of a petition being presented, to remonstrate (it being then above half-past three o'clock) against the absence of all the Ministers. The arrangement which had recently been made for the purpose of expediting the public business would be worse than useless, if from three to five o'clock the House were to receive petitions, and perhaps to enter into discussions on the Abolition of Slavery, Parliamentary Reform, and other important questions, without the presence of one of his Majesty's Ministers. Such a proceeding would be a mockery; and he trusted, therefore, that the absence of all the Ministers at that hour was a mere oversight.

Colonel *Sibthorp* was of the same opinion as that which had just been expressed by the hon. and learned Gentleman. He regretted that absence, as he had an important question to put to his Majesty's Ministers with respect to the letter which had been published from the Secretary of State for the Home Department to the Lord Mayor of London, by which it appeared, that our illustrious Sovereign, who dwelt in the hearts and affections of his people, had been advised by his Ministers to decline visiting the City, where he would have been greeted by his faithful subjects with the warmest welcome, and where blessings would have been showered upon his head. He perfectly agreed with the hon. and learned Gentleman. It was too frequently the practice that no Minister of the Crown was present in that House, to hear the petitions presented by hon. Members, or to answer any question which it might be expedient to put.

Mr. *Dundas* observed, that in less than a quarter of an hour it was probable some Minister might be present. When the House met at four o'clock, it had been usual for Ministers not to attend until about five.

Sir *Charles Burrell* said, it ought to be recollected that business of the greatest importance must be pressing on the minds and attention of his Majesty's Ministers at the present moment. He thought they were entitled to the credit of some motive of that kind for their absence. He had no connection with his Majesty's Ministers; but some consideration, in the present dreadful state of things, was due to them.

Mr. *Brougham* replied, that he was loath to say anything against any man in his absence; but he must say, that the absence of Ministers at the present moment could only tend to increase the grievous evils to which the hon. Baronet alluded, resulting from that alarm to which the conduct of Ministers had much contributed. Perhaps hon. Members were not aware, that in consequence of the King's Speech and of the letter—the absurd letter—from the Secretary of State, which had been that morning published, thousands of honest and innocent persons would be beggared. The funds had fallen no less than seven per cent in consequence of all this alarm. It was the unpopularity, not of his most sacred Majesty, who was beloved by all his subjects, but of his Majesty's advisers, which had caused all this evil. If his Majesty had determined to go to the City, unattended by any of his present Ministers, he sincerely believed that, instead of falling, the funds would have greatly risen.

Mr. *Arbuthnot* said, that he had no doubt some one of his right hon. friends would shortly be in the House, and he really thought that it was due to his Majesty's Government to defer any questions or observations of this nature, until some of his Majesty's Ministers were present to answer them.

Mr. *Brougham* perfectly agreed with the hon. Gentleman. His observations had been extorted from him by the hon. Baronet's having alluded to the present dreadful state of things; a state which appeared to him to be applicable only to the Ministers personally.

Sir R. Peel having entered the House,

THE ROYAL VISIT TO THE CITY.] Lord *Althorp* said, observing the right hon. Baronet in his place, he wished to ask him for some explanation of one of the most extraordinary and alarming events that he had ever known in the course of his public experience. He was desirous to know, what could have induced his Majesty's Ministers to expose his Majesty to the great unpopularity which might follow from his disappointing the expectations of thousands of his faithful subjects, by advising his Majesty to decline fulfilling the promise he had made to dine with the Lord Mayor to-morrow? It was not in London alone that the most serious effects would result from this affair. The alarm which the intelligence of it would create, from one end of the kingdom to the other, would necessarily be excessive. He supposed that his Majesty's Ministers had not taken an important step like this without proceeding on the most authentic information, and without the most deliberate consideration. Were it not so, their conduct would deserve the severest censure. Under these circumstances, he begged to ask the right hon. Gentleman the grounds of the measure which he had adopted.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, that however anxious he might be fully to answer the question which had been put to him by the noble Lord, and to give every information on the subject referred to which it was in his power to give, he was sure the noble Lord would not expect from him—he was sure the House would not expect from him—any declaration or statement that might be prejudicial to, or in any way interfere with, the course of the public service. The letter which had appeared in all the newspapers of the day, addressed to the Lord Mayor, was authentic, and the signature to that letter was his. That letter conveyed the deliberate opinion of his Majesty's confidential servants, that they had felt it to be their duty to advise his Majesty to postpone the visit which their Majesties intended to pay to the City of London on Tuesday next. The opinion was founded on the firm belief entertained by his Majesty's Government, that a collision of a very serious nature might take place in the attempt to maintain the public peace. Such a collision was at all times to be avoided; but peculiarly so on an occasion such as that in question. If ever an anxiety could be justly entertained to avoid such a collision, it must be at a time when an immense concourse of innocent and unsuspecting persons were assembled, at night, in the streets of the metropolis, to witness a great public festival. When it was considered that such an evil might be avoided, since there was no obligation that the festival in question must take place, and when to that was added the fact, that information had been received of an intention on the part of evil-disposed persons to make that festival a scene of tumult, and probably of bloodshed, he thought no man would deny that it was the duty of his Majesty's Ministers to give his Majesty the advice which they had given. It was his firm belief, while he was ready to do the most ample justice to the loyalty of the people of London, while he was convinced of the warmth of their attachment to their Sovereign, while he was perfectly assured that the most implicit reliance might be placed on their affection to his Majesty, while he admitted that in the great body of the people he was disposed to place the most unbounded confidence, he was perfectly persuaded, that if their Majesties were to visit the city of London, a tumult and riot would ensue, involving consequences of a most deplorable character, and perhaps leading to bloodshed. I should be doing (continued the right hon. Baronet) injustice to the feelings and character of the great body of the inhabitants of this metropolis, if I did not make an avowal of my sincere belief in their loyalty in the most distinct terms; yet, though my information leads me to believe that in their zeal and affection the utmost confidence may be placed, it also made me perceive, that it was in the power—and, unfortunately, I learnt that it was also the intention, of a few abandoned and desperate characters, to promote disorder and tumult, which it would be difficult to repress by night, without incurring the risk of inflicting that punishment on the innocent which ought to fall upon the guilty alone. On that night there would be in the streets of London not merely many good citizens and loyal men, but also an immense concourse of women and children. Supposing that an attempt should be made to involve a part of the town in darkness, in order to facilitate an attack upon either the lives or the property of a part of his Majesty's subjects, in what position would those persons, who are intrusted with, and are responsible for, the peace of the metropolis be placed, if they should be obliged to resort to force in the midst of a mixed crowd of unoffending women and children? If such a collision can be avoided, is it not right, is it not prudent, is it not the bounden duty of Ministers, to take such measures as will avoid it? I have now to inform the House, that in the course of Saturday and of Sunday last a variety of information from various quarters came into my office, which led me and the other members of his Majesty's Government to believe, that there was a possibility of a great tumult arising on Tuesday next, from the acts of a desperate and abandoned set of men, who, though few, were still sufficient in number to create very general and extensive alarm. In the course of Saturday, the Lord Mayor elect of London, the chief magistrate of the metropolis for the ensuing year, felt it to be his duty to make to the Duke of Wellington a communication, which I will now proceed to read to the House, being willing to afford it every information upon this subject which my duty will permit me at present to disclose. This communication was received by his grace the Duke of Wellington on Saturday morning.

"My Lord Duke,—From the situation of Lord Mayor, to which I have been elected, numberless communications are made to me, both personally and by letter, in reference to the 9th, and it is on that account I take the liberty of addressing your Grace.

"Although the feelings of all the respectable citizens of London are decidedly loyal, yet it cannot but be known there are, both in London as well as the country, a set of desperate and abandoned characters, who are anxious to avail themselves of any circumstance to create tumult and confusion. While all of any respectability in the City are vying with each other to testify their loyalty on the occasion, from what I learn it is the intention of some of the desperate characters above alluded to, to take the opportunity of making an attack on your Grace's person—

[*Very loud cheering, mingled with considerable laughter, from the Opposition benches*]. "Good God! A sarcastic cheer!" continued Sir R. Peel; "and made, too, in the House of Commons, on hearing that the Lord Mayor of London has communicated to the Duke of Wellington that he had reason to believe that an attack would be made on his Grace's life as he accompanied his Majesty to the civic festival! And from an officer in the army, too! [*This was an allusion to Colonel Davies, whose cheer was remarkably loud.*] Whatever may be the opinions entertained by individuals as to the official acts and political character of the Duke of Wellington, is there a single man in the country—I am sure that the gallant Colonel who cheered so loudly, when the heat of debate has passed by, will be among the first to deprecate such attempts —is there, I say, a single man of the slightest respectability in the country, who would wish to carry his political hostility to such an extent? To proceed, however, with the letter—

"While all of any respectability in the City are vying with each other to testify their loyalty on the occasion, from what I learn it is the intention of some of the desperate characters above alluded to, to take the opportunity of making an attack on your Grace's person, on your approach to the hall. Every exertion on my part shall be used to make the best possible arrangement in the City; and at the same time I feel, that should any violent attack be made in one quarter, any civil force alone might not be sufficiently effectual, and I should not be doing my duty, after what I have heard, did I not take the liberty of suggesting to your Grace the propriety of coming strongly and sufficiently guarded. I probably may be considered giving you needless trouble, but the respect which I, as well as every person who really wishes the welfare of the country, must have for your Grace, and the gratitude we owe you, have induced me to adopt this course. I have, &c. (Signed)

"John Key, Lord Mayor elect."

Here, then, was an intimation from the Lord Mayor elect of London to the Duke of Wellington, that there was no security for his Grace, on his visit to the City, unless he came provided with a large military guard. Would it be fitting, I ask, for his Grace, after all the services which he has rendered to this country, to be seen going to Guildhall accompanied and guarded by a troop of soldiers? Is that a salutary state of things, in which it is announced that a Minister of the King cannot go to meet his Sovereign at Guildhall without being exposed, I do not say to the usual symptoms of popular obloquy, but to the risk of an attack upon his person? But this is not all. Intimations reached my office that an attack was to be made upon his Grace's house in the course of the night, when the police were at a distance, under the pretence of calling for lights to illuminate. I say, that any such attack must be accompanied by riot; and that the attempt to suppress such riot by force, when the streets are filled with women and children, must be accompanied by consequences which all of us would lament. That, however, is only one of the causes which I have for believing in the possibility of such an attempt at riot taking place. Every one is aware that there exists in the public mind considerable excitement against those authorities which have been appointed, under the sanction of the House, to maintain the public peace, —I allude, of course, to the body which is known by the name of the New Police. To maintain order in that procession, had it taken place, it would have been necessary to draw together all the civil power which the New Metropolitan Police places at the disposal of the magistracy, it being desirable to resort to all civil means, in preference to military means, for the preservation of the public peace. The police must have been collected from nine o'clock in the morning, to line the procession from St. James's-palace, from which his Majesty would start, to Temple-bar, where he would enter the City. If they remained on duty all night, then those parts of the town which it is their special duty to guard, would be left unprotected; and, therefore, if there were any mischievous designs entertained against property, those designs might be easily perpetrated. If, however, each party of the police remained separated, then there would be grounds to apprehend that there would not be a sufficient civil force to maintain order in the line of procession, on an occasion when not only the ordinary population of the metropolis was likely to assemble upon it, but also a vast concourse of strangers from all parts of the country. I am now sorry to be obliged to inform the House, that in the course of Saturday and Sunday last, the most industrious attempts were made in various quarters to inflame the public mind against the new police. Thousands of printed hand-bills were circulated, some of which I will read to the House, for the purpose of shewing the means employed to inflame the people against that portion of the civil force which is intrusted with the preservation of the public tranquillity. These are not written papers, drawn up by illiterate persons, and casually dropped in the streets, but printed hand-bills, not ill-adapted for the mischievous purposes which they are intended to answer. One of them is in these terms:—

> "To arms, to arms!—Liberty or Death! London meets on Tuesday next, an opportunity not to be lost for revenging the wrongs we have suffered so long; come ARMED, be firm, and victory must be ours!!! "AN ENGLISHMAN"

Another of them is couched in the following terms:—

> "Liberty or Death! Englishmen! Britons!! and honest men!!! The time has at length arrived—all London meets on Tuesday—come armed. We assure you from ocular demonstration, that 6,000 cutlasses have been removed from the Tower, for the immediate use of Peel's Bloody Gang—remember the cursed Speech from the Throne!!—These damned Police are now to be armed. Englishmen, will you put up with this."

Now after hearing the inflammatory language of these hand-bills, I call upon the House to consider how great the likelihood is, that after the police had returned to their ordinary duties, in their respective portions of the town, a desperate attack would be made upon them. If it were made, it would, of course, be resisted by the civil force; if the civil force were insufficient to repel it, military aid would be called in; and then, on that night of general festivity and rejoicing, in the midst of crowds of unsuspecting men, women, and children, there might be resistance, and if resistance, bloodshed, occasioned by the necessity of supporting the civil authorities. I am sorry to add, that the experience of what took place at the last popular assembly fortifies the impression which the information transmitted to my office originally created in my mind,—that there might be such assaults committed by the people on the police. The last public procession which we had was on the 2nd of November, the day on which his Majesty came down to open the Session of Parliament. In the course of the night of that day, the police having attempted to apprehend certain persons discovered in the commission of crime, were violently attacked by numbers of the lower classes; and the individual who aided the police, by giving them permission to deposit their prisoners in his house, and to shelter themselves under its protection, had his house attacked and most of his windows broken. The next morning there came before the Magistrates of the different police offices in the metropolis, not less than sixty-six cases of assault committed in the course of that night on the police constables. Of those sixty-six there were ordered to find bail to appear at the Sessions, forty-two—there were fined, or in default of payment imprisoned, nineteen—there was remanded one—there were discharged on their own recognizances two—and there were also two absolutely discharged. Still there were sixty-six cases of assault committed on the police constables on the night of the 2nd of November. Such being the case, when on Saturday and Sunday the hand-bills which I have just read to you were industriously circulated, directing the people to attack the police with arms, could we, as Ministers, view without apprehension the consequences which might ensue in different parts of the metropolis, when the business of the day was concluded, and the police constables were separated by their duty in their respective districts? If unprovoked attacks were made upon them, and I have decisive evidence before me that such attacks would be made upon them, is there not danger that, in exerting the energies of self-defence, a few desperate characters might, in spite of the great loyalty of the mass of the population of London, have provoked consequences highly injurious to the public tranquillity? The House, I have no doubt, will be glad to hear, that the Government asks for no new law to repress these disorders, but is determined to enforce the old, which is sufficient for the purpose. We feel it, however, to be an imperative duty to avoid an occasion by which, in these agitated times, any collision may be produced between the constituted authorities and the people. I know the disappointment which has been experienced by the necessity of postponing the civic entertainment. I know that great sacrifices have been made, by various classes of his Majesty's faithful subjects, to pay every honour to him during his visit to the City. I was this day waited upon by the deputies of various trades, which had undertaken to protect the peace during various portions of the procession, and I could not hear, without regret, the expressions of disappointment which they uttered at finding that, though their Majesties had full confidence in the exertions of their loyalty, they were not to have the proud gratification of escorting them upon their entrance into the City. With a full knowledge of all these circumstances, I cannot help thinking that the disappointment occasioned by not holding this festival is a very subordinate consideration indeed, when placed in the balance against the maintenance of the public peace. These, Sir, are the grounds on which the members of his Majesty's Government came to the unanimous resolution of advising his Majesty that this occasion should not be given for assembling on a November night an immense concourse of people of all descriptions. I sincerely believe, that if they were assembled the public peace would be disturbed. I sincerely believe, that recourse to military authority might be necessary for its preservation, and that, in the struggle to secure it, numbers of unsuspecting and unoffending persons must unavoidably be sacrificed. If such results were probable, I ask again whether it was not our duty, as the responsible Ministers of the Crown, to advise his Majesty to forego the satisfaction of visiting the City of London, in order to spare him and his consort the permanent pain of having been unconsciously the cause of bloodshed and suffering to their unoffending subjects? I know not whether the House will approve of the course which we have adopted upon this occasion. I know that it will be said that the Government is unpopular, whilst his Majesty is most enthusiastically beloved by his people. It is my duty to bear that taunt, rather than forbear from giving that advice, of which the adoption is calculated to secure the tranquillity of the metropolis,—to prevent the loss of life—and to prevent, above all, any addition to that excitement of feeling which is at present so much to be deplored. I will submit to any taunt founded on the obloquy or objectionable character of the Ministry among the people, rather than give them any cause for excitement which I can possibly avoid."

Mr. *Brougham* assured the right hon. Secretary that he should hear no taunt from him on this painful occasion. But, though he gave the right hon. Secretary that assurance, he nevertheless felt it necessary to return his thanks to his noble friend near him for having elicited from the right hon. Secretary the statement which he had just made. He could assure the right hon. Secretary, that the few words which he was going to address to the House were intended to add to the effect which his speech would have in quieting the alarm, which he would not say had been excited without any cause, but which he thought had been excited without sufficient cause, in this great metropolis. Though it was not strictly right for him to address the Chair at present, there being no question regularly before it, still he trusted that a consideration of the public convenience, and of the peace and tranquillity of this great metropolis, and he might even say of the country, would be admitted by the Speaker as a sufficient excuse for his saying a few words, although irregularly, to the House. He felt exceedingly sorrowful that a festival, by which the good City of London had set such store, should not be holden with all that pomp and pride of circumstance which, of old custom, belonged to it, and with that which, on this occasion, gave to it its chief interest,—he meant the presence of the Royal Family. That was not, however, the event which he chiefly lamented upon this occasion. The alarm which had been excited by the unexpected appearance of the right hon. Secretary's letter was so great, that the most awful mercantile inconvenience must result from it. Within a very short time after its appearance, the Stocks fell three per cent; and that fall of three per cent, be it minded, was in addition to a fall of four per cent, which occurred last week. He did honestly and sincerely confess, that he looked with apprehension to the probable consequences of so unexpected a fall. Many a good man and many a worthy family, engaged in the ordinary transactions of commerce, and not indulging in wild and dangerous speculation, would find himself reduced, in a single week, from a state of affluence to a state of beggary, by the blow which such sudden revulsions always gave to public credit. If, then, anything which he could say could have a tendency to lessen the existing panic,—and he assured the right hon. Secretary that what he was going to say was intended to accomplish that object, and that object alone,—if he could succeed in showing to the public that there was no reason for anticipating that general confusion and disturbance of which the letter of the right hon. Secretary, appearing without the explanation which he had just given, was calculated to excite the idea—if he could succeed in removing and allaying the apprehension which was now so general in the City, and which would soon be equally general in the country at large, he thought that he should be rendering, as he did it conscientiously, an acceptable service both to the Government and to the House. He considered the statement of the right hon. Secretary as very satisfactory in one point, and calculated to produce much good. The right hon. Secretary had admitted that there was no deficiency of loyalty, of good conduct, and of peaceable demeanour among the great, opulent, virtuous, and intelligent classes, of which the population of London and Westminster was composed. He had avowed that they were not merely not tainted with disaffection, but that they had even been singularly forward in the readiness with which they had volunteered to assist in maintaining the public peace. That statement would be of the utmost importance in allaying the notion that there was any intention on the part of the people to revolt against their present form of Government. As to the remaining part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech, to what did it amount? It amounted simply to this—that it was a bad thing to have a large assembly of the people on the 9th of November, and for this reason,—that though 999 men out of 1,000 then assembled might be peaceably and loyally disposed, yet the odd units—the few who were riotously inclined—might put out the lights in the street, might involve the town in darkness, and might afterwards commence a scene of riot and confusion, which could not end without bloodshed! Now if this were any objection to his Majesty's attendance at the civic festival, it was not an objection to which the course of events had suddenly given birth within the two or three last days. Every one acquainted with the state of society in this country must be aware, that such an event as his Majesty's visit to the City must, from its very rarity, collect thousands, if not myriads, to witness it, so that any accident to which the metropolis was exposed at present, from the collection of a large mass of people together, must have been as palpable a month ago as it is now. The right hon. Secretary had told the House, that it was the duty of Ministers to advise his Majesty not to visit the City if there was a possibility of any accident occurring in consequence of his visit. Now, with all deference to the right hon. Secretary, he did not think, that he had alleged a sufficient reason for his Majesty's not appearing among a loyal and affectionate people, who anxiously expected his presence. If he had said thus much in justice to the inhabitants of this great metropolis, and to allay the apprehensions which he knew they felt, it gave him great pleasure to make another remark, in justice to his Majesty. If it had appeared that, on a given day, it was universally believed that the King could go safely to Guildhall, and yet that, within two or three days afterwards, in consequence of a certain event, a notion had got into circulation that he could not go there without danger,—if such an idea had remained unexplained, it might sanction an opinion at home, and more especially abroad, where the King's immense and well-deserved popularity was not so well understood,—it might look, he said, as if, for some new and undefined reason, that popularity had become endangered to such a degree, that his Majesty could not meet his faithful commons of London without fear of a tumult and riot. But the speech of the right hon. Secretary had convinced him to the contrary. "My conscientious opinion," said Mr. Brougham, "is, that his Majesty may go safely to Guildhall now, without suffering any inconvenience, save that arising from the pressure occasioned by the eager wishes of his affectionate and faithful subjects to behold him;—ay, as safely as he confessedly could have done before the country heard the Speech from the Throne. I must regret that a trial was not made of the affection which his people bear to his Majesty. But perhaps the error, if it be one, is on the safe side. I cannot, however, help thinking, that it is a little hard on his Majesty, that in consequence of nothing—not even a syllable,—having been said in the proclamation of this morning as to whose unpopularity it is, that causes the postponement of the civic festivities, it should be made to appear as if it were the unpopularity of the King, and not that of his Ministers. Whereas it now appears, on the showing of one of the Ministers themselves, that if his Majesty would go to Guildhall, and if the Duke of Wellington would stay at home, the King, being unattended by his unpopular companion, would be received with the most sincere and heartfelt exultation by a loyal, an affectionate, and a grateful people, whilst the noble Duke, being left at home to defend his own house, would, from his well-known gallantry, find no person hardy enough to attack it. I regret much the appearance of the letter of this morning,—I regret it on account of the mischief which it is certain to cause in the mercantile world,—I regret it also on account of its apparent connexion with that Speech from the Throne, followed up, as that fatal Speech has been, by the still more fatal declaration of the Duke of Wellington, against every species of reform,—a declaration to which, in my conscience I believe, he owes nine-tenths of his present unpopularity. I wish that that declaration had not been made. I wish, also, that I had not lived to see the day, when a forgetfulness of those invaluable services in the field,—which have made for the Duke of Wellington, as a soldier, a general, and a conqueror, a great, a brilliant, and imperishable renown, coupled with a deviation by the noble Duke from his own sphere of life, into the labyrinths of politics, and with an attempt on his part to shine as a great statesman,—a character which nature, that formed him a great General, never intended that he should become—I wish, I repeat, that I had not lived to see the day, when the forgetfulness of his great merits by the rabble,—a forgetfulness never to be pardoned, always to be condemned; for no deficiency on the part of the Duke of Wellington as a politician ought to eradicate the gratitude which we all owe to him as a soldier; and even as a statesman, he is not without his merits — I wish to heaven, I once more repeat, that I had not lived to see the day, when the forgetfulness of the people to the merits of the soldier, and the forgetfulness of the soldier to his own proper sphere of greatness, has displayed to England, to Europe, and to the world, that the Duke of Wellington cannot accompany his Majesty on his journey into the heart of an attached and loyal population."

Colonel *Davies* felt compelled to address the House upon this occasion, in consequence of the pointed allusion which had been made to a cheer of his by the right hon. Secretary. He could not conceive how the right hon. Secretary could so misconstrue his cheer as to suppose that it meant an approval of any attack which the ruffian rabble might make upon the person of the Duke of Wellington. He viewed with as much indignation as a man could do the infamous attacks which had recently been made upon his Grace by some of the lowest ruffians in the country. What caused his cheer and astonishment was, that after such an alarming letter as that which appeared in the newspapers that morning—a letter containing a declaration, which he conceived, could only be justified by the discovery of some widespread conspiracy against the Throne—it should turn out, that the main, and indeed the only reason, why the City was disappointed of a visit from its Sovereign, was the unpopularity of the Prime Minister. Was it the intention of the Duke of Wellington, now that he found that he could not raise his own popularity to the same height with that of his Majesty, to bring down his Majesty's popularity to the same level with his own unpopularity? He could not admit that the right hon. Secretary had made out any case sufficient to justify the postponement of his Majesty's visit to the City. He had told the House that he expected to have the police attacked in the course of the evening, provided his Majesty dined in the City to-morrow; but he had not informed the House, why the same attack would not be made upon them, provided his Majesty should persist in his present determination to stay away.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, that however tempting the occasion might be, he would not enter into any of those questions of party-feeling which the hon. and learned Gentleman had raised in the course of his speech. His object was, to co-operate with the hon. and learned Gentleman in his endeavour to calm the public feeling. He would therefore endeavour to abstain from replying to the sarcasms into which the hon. and learned Gentleman had so naturally fallen. He cordially admitted the hon. and learned Gentleman's intentions; and he wished to state, in the most clear and positive terms, that the hon. and learned Gentleman had put a correct construction upon his language. "I believe with him," said Sir Robert Peel, "that the King and Queen might safely go to Guildhall to-morrow without any other inconvenience, save that arising from the exuberant loyalty of the people. I believe with him, that from one part of the procession to the other, there would have been nothing but one universal demonstration of loyalty and affection to their Majesties. I believe that every man possessed of property in the metropolis would have been ready to expose himself to any danger for its protection, and for the protection of the public peace. I know that among those who had confederated for that purpose were 1,400 or 1,500 persons connected with the first houses in London. So far am I from wishing to have it inferred that there was any disloyalty among the citizens of London, that I now declare my sincere conviction to be, that never was there an occasion on which greater attachment to the King, and a stronger disposition to maintain the public peace, were displayed. Still let the House reflect on the condition in which the metropolis would have been placed. All the firemen would have been engaged as guardians of the public peace. To maintain order in the line of procession all the ordinary police of London must have been on duty by as early an hour as nine o'clock in the morning. With all the facts which came to the knowledge of the Government, I did not think it safe to leave all the suburbs of London exposed to plunder for the whole of to-morrow. What I stated in my former speech, and what I repeat now is, that voluntarily to get together, on a November evening, a large concourse of innocent people, men, women, and children, when certain agents of mischief are known to be at work, may be productive of consequences which should be avoided if possible. The gallant Officer says, that in spite of the postponement of his Majesty's visit, the attack on the police may still take place to-morrow night. It may so; but then, mark the difference. The association of the people to-morrow night will be voluntary, and without apparent cause, and, now that warning is given, must be only for mischief; whereas, if the King's visit had not been postponed, the association would have been sanctioned by the Magistrates, and would have been, as far as they could discriminate, perfectly innocent. I beg pardon for again intruding so long upon the House. I merely rose to state, that the hon. and learned Gentleman has put the exact construction that I could have wished upon my words, and that, if any opinion has got abroad that there is disloyalty in London, that opinion is quite groundless. In conclusion, I beg leave to state my sincere conviction, that there never was a Sovereign on the British Throne better entitled to, and more in possession of, the undivided affections of his people, than his present Majesty. If I omitted to state that circumstance before, it was only because I thought it too notorious to require mention."

Colonel *Sibthorp* rose to assure the right hon. Secretary, that in proposing the very question which had just been put to him by the noble member for Northamptonshire, to another Minister, before he (Sir R. Peel) entered the House, he had not done so from any want of courtesy to the right hon. Secretary. A sense of what was due to his King, his constituents, and his country, had urged him to press for the earliest intelligence on this most important subject.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* said, that it was impossible for him to remain silent upon this occasion, without disregarding one of the most sacred duties which he owed to his constituents, who had been placed in a most extraordinary situation by the conduct of the Government. We were told that we had a King of the most popular character, and yet that he could not partake of a dinner with his good citizens of London without running the risk of seeing the public peace disturbed by a handful of desperate and abandoned men. With such an imputation on the City of London, it was incumbent upon him to state to the House one or two facts, which it was important that the public should know, in addition to those which had already been mentioned by the right hon. Secretary. He must mention, in the first place, that when he left the Court of Aldermen that day, who were specially convened to consider of Sir Robert Peel's letter, there was but one opinion on the subject in the whole court: all the members were astonished and confounded by the contents of that letter. Having long acted as Magistrates for the metropolis,—having sat in committee every day for some weeks past, in order to superintend the arrangements at Guildhall,—and having sworn in a number of most respectable citizens as special constables, they were indeed surprised, with all the information which they possessed as Magistrates, at hearing to-day, for the first time, that there was cause for apprehending a breach of the peace in the City. After some inquiry it appeared, that a communication had taken place between the right hon. Secretary and a deputation of three Common Councilmen, the Lord Mayor elect, and an Alderman, now acting for the present Lord Mayor. He would not enter into a repetition of what passed at their interview, for the right hon. Secretary could inform them of it more clearly than he could. When the Committee was asked whether they were apprehensive of a riot, their answer was, unequivocally "we are not." He (Mr. Waithman) knew, however, that the Lord Mayor elect had written a letter to the Duke of Wellington on the subject of his personal safety, warning him that it would be endangered if he came into the City. When the Committee was asked whether, in their opinion, there was the slightest cause for apprehension, they expressed their most decided judgment in the negative. An hon. Baronet and Alderman, had been running about a good deal backwards and forwards, had been making communications from one quarter to another, on the ground, as it would appear, that he thought he knew much more than others; whereas it was clear, from his communications, that he knew much less. It was an astounding circumstance that the Lord Mayor elect should have communicated that information, which was deemed so important as to occasion more than one or two Cabinet Councils, and had ended in such a result, without having made the slightest communication of it to the Magistrates of London. The result was, a reflection upon the whole Magistracy of the City of London, importing that they were incompetent to preserve order in the City, which they were ready, one and all, indignantly to repel.—Whence the Lord Mayor elect had received his information —information so important as to have been the occasion of the most disastrous disappointment to the whole metropolis—he could not tell. Until informed of his communication by the letter of the Secretary of State, the Court of Aldermen were utterly ignorant of it. It was a gross reflection, he repeated, by whomever made, and one that he was authorized indignantly to repel, to suppose that the City Magistrates, and the police under their command, could not have prevented any breach of the peace. What, then, was the plain truth of the matter? Why it must be, either that his Majesty did not possess the affection of the people, or that his Majesty had an obnoxious Ministry; and there could be no doubt which of these two was the fact, for every body knew, that no British Monarch was ever more beloved by his people than was William IV. The Ministers seemed to have doubted whether the letter of the Lord Mayor was a forgery or not; for, at nine o'clock on Sunday night, the Under Secretary of State came into the city to inquire whether or not it was a genuine letter of the Lord Mayor elect; and the Under Secretary of State brought with him a letter, which he was to deliver to the Lord Mayor if it turned out that the other letter was genuine, but which he was to take back again if it turned out to be a forgery. Nothing could exceed the consternation, the universal consternation, which this absurd proceeding had excited in the City. It had affected the funds, as they had all heard; it had affected the trading interests of every description; and the alarm would quickly spread throughout the country. And all this mischief had been caused by timidity or folly without any ground or reason! Was it not, he would ask the House, most extraordinary that the Lord Mayor had not consulted any of his colleagues; that none of the City Magistrates had been thought wise enough to be trusted with this important information; and that those who represented the City of London in Parliament, and who were at the same time Magistrates of the City, should have heard nothing about this intended breach of the peace? Yet this was the fact; the Lord Mayor had asked the opinion of no one, had consulted with no one. He could not express, because he could not trust himself with, language to express the indignation he felt at such conduct. As to what might have happened,—he had very little apprehension that any thing would have happened on the other side of Temple Bar—on this side Temple Bar, it was for the Ministers to watch, and be answerable for, that. Let it not be supposed that he was insensible to the wickedness and the malice of those who molested the new police; he blamed them as much as any one could, and if he had opposed the establishment of the new police in the City, it was only because he did not wish to see the peculiar laws and usages of the City broken in upon. However, if the new police and the Ministers could not have preserved the peace, on such an occasion as this, out of the City, he would tell the House who could, and who would, have preserved the peace, both in and out of the City during his Majesty's visit;—the citizens would, the respectable tradesmen and shopkeepers of the City of London would, he was sure, have willingly undertaken this office, if there had been any necessity for it, and have conducted his Majesty peaceably to Guildhall. The Ministers ought to have known this, and ought not to have advised his Majesty as they had. He verily believed that the Ministers, by this act, had signed their own death-warrant, they had committed an act of political suicide, and that, if any jury were called to sit upon them, no other verdict but "insanity" would be brought in. He could not sit down without once more impressing upon hon. Members that there was no danger, that there was no cause of fear, that the citizens of London were able and willing to have prevented any breach of the peace, and his Majesty, he was sure, might have visited the City, and heard no other sound than the boisterous merriment of a delighted people.

Mr. *Hobhouse* said, that as member for the City of Westminster, he trusted that he might be allowed to say a few words on the present occasion, promising the House that they should be very few. He had felt it his duty to inquire, so far as his means extended, since the delivery of the Speech from the Throne, and since the declaration which the Prime Minister had made in the other House of Parliament, whether any change had taken place in public opinion respecting the Government or his Majesty. His inquiries on this subject had been neither few nor limited, and the result of those inquiries enabled him to assert with confidence, that there was no disaffection at all among the people. That word either was, or ought to be, always applied with reference to the general Government of the country, and not with regard to the particular Administration of the day. Using the word in this its only proper sense, he repeated, that he might with confidence assert, that towards the august person who filled the Throne, and towards the established Government of the country, as a limited monarchy, no disaffection at all existed among the people. But he should not do his duty if he stopped here: he should be unworthy of the place he filled in that House if he hesitated to speak out on an occasion like the present. Disaffection there was among the people, but it was disaffection towards the Ministry. Among the people there did exist the strongest feeling against the longer continuance of those gentlemen in office, and he must say, he did very much wonder, considering the many hints those gentlemen had received, that they did not find out that there was another alternative open to them besides preventing his Majesty from attending the City festival. This other alternative had been suggested to him by many gentlemen, not only among those with whom he commonly acted, but by gentlemen connected with his Majesty's Government. The alternative to which he alluded was, that the Ministers should have resigned their places. The introduction of party politics, on an occasion like the present, had been deprecated; but the whole question was, whether the Ministers ought not to have considered,—before exciting the consternation which had resulted from that letter of the right hon. Secretary,—whether they could not have prevented all chance of a disturbance, and whether they could not have effectually secured the preservation of the public peace, by going out of office. If they thought not, then they had, no doubt, acted in a manner which their consciences must tell them was right. He told the Ministers the other night—what they must have known to be quite true—that there had never been effected so great an alteration in the public feeling, in so short a time, as that which had been manifested since that fatal Speech from the Throne, and that still more fatal declaration of the Duke of Wellington. His firm conviction was, that if the King's Ministers had resigned to-day, the King might have gone to Guildhall to-morrow, not only without the Duke of Wellington exposing himself to danger, as, God forbid the Duke or any other man should! but amidst the redoubled acclamations of the people. To that determination the Ministers might be assured they must come at last, and, that too, at no very distant period. They might be assured too, that there was a deep and strong feeling pervading the whole of the country, that there must be a change in the system by which the so-called Representatives of the people were returned to that House; and if the Duke of Wellington would not accede to this desire on the part of the people, they must find a Minister who would. If the present Ministry took the same view of this subject as the Duke of Wellington had taken, the sooner they retired the better.

Mr. *Brownlow* could not help breaking through the rooted disinclination he had to address the House, and giving vent to the expression of the grief, the disappointment, and the unmeasured indignation he felt at this transaction. When he recollected that the King of England,—his King, to whom he owed his allegiance, and to whom he was ready, with his allegiance, to offer his heart and love,—a King the most popular, and justly the most popular, that had ever ascended the Throne, and who might have wandered from Wapping to St. James's unattended by a single soldier or policeman,—when he recollected that such a King should have had for Ministers men who had put such a Speech into his mouth, that they seemed determined to make him the offensive organ of unpopular sentiments,—he could not refrain from giving expression to his feelings. But for this conduct on the part of the Ministers, there would have been no pretence for the unwise and unjustifiable proceeding, out of which the present discussion had arisen. Was it not clear, however, from all that they had heard, that there was no disaffection towards his Majesty? What, then, had been the cause of the postponement of his Majesty's visit to the City? The meaning of the transaction was obviously this—that the Ministers had, by the Speech they had put into his Majesty's mouth, displayed a heartless indifference towards the people, not sympathising with their sufferings, but turning a deaf ear to their wishes. For this conduct it was, that the Ministers, not the King, feared to trust themselves among the people, who would have proved to them, more to their conviction than to their satisfaction, that they did not preside over the councils of the country with the popular voice in their favour. The Ministers feared the expression of popular disapprobation, and they had, therefore, advised his Majesty to remain at home. He wished it to be understood, and he trusted that it would be understood, from one end of the country to the other, that it was the Ministers, and not the King, that had anything to fear. As for the Duke of Wellington, he did not believe that a single hair of his head would have been touched. The fact was, that the Duke of Wellington had shrunk from the expression of popular disapprobation, and, in order to shield himself from that, he had covered himself with the Royal mantle

Mr. Alderman *Thompson* rose for the purpose of confirming the statement which had been made by the hon. Alderman opposite (Waithman) which was doubtless correct, though the hon. Alderman had mentioned some matters which he (Mr. Alderman Thompson) should not have thought himself justified in introducing here. True it unquestionably was, that only one feeling— a feeling of affection and loyalty to the King—pervaded the whole body of the citizens of London, and, in his own mind, he had no doubt that, from the arrangements which the Magistrates had made, the entertainment to his Majesty would have passed off without any breach of the peace. Every measure for the preservation of the peace had been taken, and no less than 1,600 special constables had been appointed in addition to the ordinary police force of the City. Further than this, a body of respectable citizens, residing in the eastern part of the metropolis, amounting to between 4,000 and 5,000, had sent in their names and places of residence, and offered their services for the purpose of keeping the peace. While he admitted this, yet, when he considered the nature of that unfortunate and unauthorized communication which had been made by the Mayor elect, to the executive Government, he must say, that he thought the Government had been placed in a very delicate and embarrassing situation. He had been in that House long enough to have heard motions made on the subject of the collision which took place between the people and the military at Manchester, and he was quite sure, that every Gentleman who heard him would have bitterly regretted so unfortunate a circumstance as that one drop of blood should have been spilt in a similar collision to-morrow. While, therefore, he regretted the unauthorised communication that had been made to the executive Government, and while he regretted also the disappointment which had resulted to the citizens from that communication, yet he could not concur with those Gentlemen who had stigmatized the Ministers for the advice they had given to his Majesty. He was anxious, however, to rescue the Magistrates of the city of London from the imputation of timidity. The Court of Aldermen had that day come to the following resolution:—

> "This Court doth hereby take the earliest opportunity of informing their fellow-citizens, that they most unequivocally and decidedly disavow the knowledge of any communication made to the Government of the inability of the magistracy to preserve the peace of the metropolis on the Lord Mayor's day (which they are bound and ready with their lives to maintain on all occasions,) because they are quite satisfied of the complete efficiency of the police, and that the steps taken by the magistracy to increase the civil force were commensurate to the highly important occasion of his Majesty's visit to this great City; and they cannot but lament that any representation should have been made which has had the effect of influencing the postponement of his Majesty's visit to this loyal City of London. (Signed)
> "WOODTHORPE."

Sir *Robert Peel* said, he could only state, that on Saturday two Aldermen came to him, as from the City authorities, one of whom was the Lord Mayor elect, and the other a gentleman who said, he was deputed by the late Lord Mayor. These gentlemen told him, that the civil power in the City would not be sufficient for the preservation of the public peace, and asked for the attendance of a body of the military. He referred these gentlemen to the Horse Guards. Now, after receiving such a communication as this, and listening to the speech of the hon. Alderman (Thompson), he must say, that, considering the heavy responsibility that rested with him, he wished that the magistrates of the City of London would be good enough to depute proper persons to make communications to the Government.

Mr. Alderman *Thompson* said, that he had not cast any responsibility upon the right hon. Secretary. In justice to the right hon. Secretary, to the Magistrates of the City of London, and for the satisfaction of the House, he felt himself called upon to state, that those two individuals, whom the right hon. Secretary had referred to, had not only no authority to make any such communication to the Government from the Corporation, but that the fact of their having made that communication was totally unknown to the Magistrates of the City.

Sir *R. Peel* said, he could not, of course, know what authority those two gentlemen had, but they certainly represented themselves to him as authorized to make the communication he had mentioned. One of them being the Lord Mayor elect, and the other acting for the late Lord Mayor, it never occurred to him to question them as to their authority, and certainly the offices they filled seemed to point them out as very fit persons to make such a communication, for to them, one might naturally suppose would be left the arrangements for the preservation of the public peace.

Mr. *Hughes Hughes* said, that he begged to call the attention of the House to a letter which had been received by a respectable tradesman, and of which he had obtained a copy. It ran thus:—

> "Sir; If you let or illuminate any part of your house on the 9th, your life will be in peril. There is at present too many Englishmen starving to let money be spent so.
> (Signed) "SWING."

[*Cries of* "*Oh! oh!*" *and much laughter.*] The respectable tradesman who received this letter did not laugh at it; but, on the contrary, seemed inclined to disappoint his friends to whom he had promised places, and also to refrain from illuminating. A great many other tradesmen, he was informed, had received similar communications; and he thought that, under all circumstances, the step which the Ministers had taken was a judicious one. He begged to remind hon. Members that the information communicated by the Lord Mayor ought to be received without suspicion, because, in adopting this course, the Lord Mayor had sacrificed both honour and popularity.

Mr. *Hume* said, it was lamentable to see the situation into which the metropolis had been plunged in the short space of nine days. He maintained, that the personal popularity of the Sovereign was undiminished, but he contended that it was a lamentable thing that, in consequence of the presence in his Majesty's Council of one single individual this metropolis had been put in imminent danger; for he understood that the presence of the noble Duke at the head of the Government was one of the main causes of the alarm. He trusted, that the House of Commons would feel it their duty immediately to lay an Address before his Majesty, respectfully soliciting him to dismiss the noble Duke and his colleagues from his councils; for the whole population in this City, and in the country, was against them. It was to him (Mr. Hume) a matter of astonishment how any man in that House could sit still, and not feel it his duty to move an Address for the dismissal from his Majesty's councils of those evil counsellors whose conduct had excited so much alarm and irritation. He was confident that to-morrow would be characterized in the City by tranquillity and peace. If the inhabitants of this metropolis valued their rights as Englishmen, and if they wished to see the Duke of Wellington removed from office, they would to-morrow exhibit the most orderly and peaceable demeanor.

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* agreed with the hon. member for Middlesex, that if his Majesty's Ministers deserved to be dismissed from office, it was the duty of those hon. Members in that House who entertained that opinion to move an Address for their removal. They only deserved to remain in office as long as they retained the confidence of Parliament; and if they had lost that confidence, it was only for Parliament to pronounce its decision, and they would bow to that decision, not only with deference, but even with satisfaction. He said with satisfaction, and he would repeat it, because there could be to them no greater satisfaction than to see the Government of the country placed in those hands in which Parliament thought it should be placed. They had been told, that it was the duty of Ministers, after they had given the advice which they did give, to have resigned last night, and it was said, that if they had done so, his Majesty might then have proceeded triumphantly and tranquilly to the City to-morrow. But what would be the opinion of Ministers if they had acted in such a manner? Would not the hon. gentleman (the member for Westminster) be himself, in that case, the very first to tax them with cowardice, because they determined to forbear accompanying his Majesty to Guildhall to-morrow? Would they not be told that they had brought his Majesty into a difficulty,—that they had involved him in a perplexity, and had left him to get out of it as well as he could; and that they had left the City of London without any adequate means for repressing the disorders which they had anticipated would take place? He would, in conclusion, again express a hope, that if the hon. member for Middlesex was of opinion that his Majesty's Ministers should be removed from office, he would bring the question forward as soon as possible.

Sir *J. Graham* was very unwilling to come forward at a moment of very great excitement, when more mischief might be done by a Member's expressing his sentiments than by his retaining them to himself. He had, therefore, determined to forbear from expressing his sentiments, strong as they might be, on this occasion; but he had been induced to depart from that determination in consequence of the speech of the right hon. gentleman who had just sat down. That right hon. gentleman had intimated, that if that House should come to a decision that the public interests no longer demanded the services of himself and his colleagues, they would receive that decision with satisfaction. Now, if he (Sir James Graham) did not greatly misunderstand the feeling of the country, that feeling had — particularly within the last few days, in consequence of the declaration of the noble Duke (Wellington) in another place, and of the sentiments expressed in that House by the right hon. gentleman, the Secretary for the Home Department, respecting the vital and all-important question of reform—set strongly against the Ministry, and he was sure that the vast majority of the people of this great country did not place any confidence in his Majesty's Ministers. But the right hon. gentleman (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had endeavoured to taunt them for not bringing forward at once a motion for the dismissal of the Ministry, if they were of opinion that they deserved to be dismissed. The Ministers were, no doubt, anxious that it should be brought forward in that manner, but he (Sir James Graham) was opposed to a premature discussion of that question, aware as he was that, in consequence of the constitution of that House, the bringing forward a question in such a shape, and before the public mind was properly prepared for it, would be the most effectual way to strengthen any Administration. He therefore trusted, that it would not be brought forward now, that they would go on with the Orders, as they had been entered in the Order-book, and that upon this day se'nnight the sense of the Commons of England would be taken upon that which he (Sir James Graham) considered the most vital and important of all questions,—namely, whether it was expedient or not that the state of the representation of the people of the United Kingdom should be considered, with a view to its Amendment. In reference to that question, the Duke of Wellington had declared himself against all reform, and the right hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Peel) had declared himself unable to see his way, and that he could give no opinion upon it. His Majesty's Ministers, therefore and the public had come to an issue upon that great question, whether it was expedient that the state of the representation should be considered, with a view to its alteration. That was the point upon which they had come to an issue, and, as far as he could see, the declaration which had been made by the Duke of Wellington against reform, and the sentiments which had been expressed by the right hon. Baronet, had, in an incredibly short period of time, effected the greatest possible change in the sentiments of the public with regard to the Ministry. The right hon. gentleman, in his letter published that morning, had stated that it would be dangerous for his Majesty to go in a procession to the City "by night." Why, within one short week from that day, his Majesty had gone in a procession "by night;" he had gone to the theatre, and he had encountered no danger whatever, but was, on the contrary, rewarded by the most loyal and enthusiastic demonstrations of affection on the part of an attached and devoted people. What had since intervened? That celebrated declaration of his Majesty's Prime Minister, that nothing should induce him to discuss this question of reform; and that, if it should be brought forward by others, it should be opposed by him. From coming into contact with a great body of constituents, he was tolerably well acquainted with the opinions of the population of this country; and he would say upon that point, in reference to which the Duke of Wellington had declared that he would concede nothing, that his Grace was at direct issue with the people of England; and when he said the people of England, he meant, not merely the lower orders, but the middle classes of society, in conformity with whose sentiments the Government must be conducted, or it could not stand. The right hon. Baronet had himself, upon a former occasion, stated, that he rested upon public opinion, and that he was ready to stand or fall by its decision. Now, public opinion demanded a reform of the representation in the Commons House of Parliament, and while the right hon. Baronet and his colleagues declared that they would not grant it, the people of England said that it must be granted, or that there would be no peace in the realm, and no security for property. That was the point on which the Ministers and the people of England had come to issue, and which he hoped would soon be brought to trial. He trusted, therefore, that no premature discussion would be introduced with regard to the confidence of Parliament in Ministers, but that upon the great question of reform the decision of the House should be taken. That declaration of the Duke of Wellington which had rendered him so unpopular, had astounded, alarmed, and confounded the people of England. The noble Duke had previously enjoyed a portion of the confidence of the public, but that declaration had made him the most unpopular Minister that was ever known in England. At the same time he (Sir J. Graham) must say, and he said so from the bottom of his heart, that any act of personal violence offered to that noble Duke would be a stain upon the annals of this country, which years of future glory would never wash away. He did hope whatever opinion might exist as to the civil conduct of his Grace, that eternal gratitude, which he deserved for his splendid military services, for his dauntless valour, and for his glorious achievements, would wait on him, and that his person or his life would never be placed in hazard in this country. He feared that the noble Duke was too fond of ruling alone, and that he was obstinately attached to that policy which he thought was right; but he trusted that the noble Duke would not continue obstinately to pursue a line of policy which might place the peace and the prosperity of the country in jeopardy, and in his conscience he believed that public opinion had pronounced—decidedly pronounced—against the policy of the noble Duke.

Mr. *Slaney* said, that at this moment the people were most anxious to ascertain the amount of the danger which the letter of the right hon. Baronet anticipated that they would have had to encounter if his Majesty had persevered in his determination to dine in the city to-morrow. It appeared from what had been disclosed in the course of the present discussion, that the danger would have been much less than had been supposed. The line of conduct adopted by his Majesty's Ministers had been founded upon the busy, and, he must say, the unauthorized communications of two Aldermen,—communications which had been repudiated by the Aldermen who represented the City of London in that House. He was surprised that no inquiry had been made by the Government in the first place, as to the authenticity of the information communicated by the Lord Mayor elect. It appeared to him that in this instance the Government had committed a great error by acting on the incorrect information communicated by two busy, and, as it now appeared, unauthorized Aldermen.

Sir *C. Forbes* remarked, that much had been said in the course of the present debate, upon what was termed the just unpopularity of the noble Duke at the head of his Majesty's Administration; but the services which that illustrious individual had performed for this country and for Europe, in a military point of view, and lately to the United Kingdom, by removing the disabilities of the Roman Catholics entitled him to our gratitude, and would send his name down to posterity as one of the greatest Ministers who ever presided over the Administration of affairs in this country. He would ask the House, indeed, and more especially the hon. Gentleman opposite, what the situation of Ireland at this moment would have been if the measure of Catholic Emancipation had not been carried? There could be no doubt but that it would have been in the same situation as Belgium. When so much was said of the unpopularity of Ministers, and so earnest a wish was expressed that they should retire from office, he desired to ask if they retired, who were to succeed them. For his own part he knew no man fit to be at the head of the Administration of the country at this time but the Duke of Wellington. It was very easy to say that there was a decided feeling of hostility towards his Majesty'sMinisters, but so far as his opportunities of ascertaining the fact had enabled him to come to a decision, he should say, that out of doors no such feeling existed. He was sure that the majority of the people were in favour of the present Ministry, and he felt confident, that when that question should be put to the test, the result would confirm his opinion. Every one knew that when a feeling had been expressed by any influential man, or set of men, hostile to the measures adopted by his Majesty's Government, it was easy to bring a very large number of persons who, on usual occasions, had been in the habit of expressing approbation of the measures of the Government—it was easy to bring those persons over to follow the opposite course.

Mr. *Denman* participated entirely in the sentiments of disgust which had been expressed by the hon. member for Cumberland, at the personal attacks which had been made upon one of the greatest men of the day, whose extraordinary military services in the cause of the country ought to shield him against personal attacks on account of political opinion. Descending from such a distinguished character to men of far humbler station in the country, he was desirous to bear his testimony against those brutal and savage outrages which had been committed against a body of men who had been of the greatest service to the metropolis. The most savage attacks had been made upon the new police, and having witnessed their conduct, he must say, that it appeared to him that they were, generally speaking, an active, steady, well-conducted, and respectable set of men. It was true, that some of them had been brought into disgrace, but they were few, and were punished by the officers of their own corps. He had witnessed the conduct of the inspectors of police, a very respectable class of officers, and from what he had seen of them upon jury trials, they were excellent members of a very useful body of men, who deserved the thanks of the community, instead of the violence by which they had been assailed. It appeared to him that the unfortunate step which Ministers had taken, originated in an unfounded alarm. When the two Aldermen waited on the right hon. Baronet opposite, he should have asked them whether they had been deputed by the Court of Aldermen to make the communication which they had made, and what were the grounds upon which they had formed their opinion. That respectable individual, the Lord Mayor elect, had been made the scapegoat on this occasion. He was not a Member of that House, and had only expressed an opinion, in consequence, perhaps, of rumours which he might have heard, and which might not have reached other quarters. The Lord Mayor thought it right to make a communication to the Duke of Wellington on the subject, but the Government should not have acted upon that communication until they had first ascertained the grounds upon which it rested, and what reasons there were for thinking that the Duke of Wellington would be assailed. The late disgraceful attacks upon his Grace had been instigated by persons whose interest it was to make a tumult, and who consisted, principally of that same class which assailed the new police, and which unfortunately amounted to thousands in great towns; namely, pickpockets, and vagabonds of that description. But the unfortunate step which Ministers had taken in consequence of an unauthorized communication, had inflicted a deep wound on the loyalty of the country; and the effect of it on foreign nations was likely to be most disastrous to us, whatever might be the circumstances, whether of negotiation or hostility, in which we might be placed. As that step had plainly not originated with his Majesty himself, he must express a hope that his Majesty would name another, and an early day to honour the citizens of his good city of London with his company, and he had no doubt that his Majesty would receive the assembled thanks of a vast multitude on that occasion.

Sir *R. Peel* said, it had been assumed that the communication of the Lord Mayor elect had been the only one that had been received by his Majesty's Government, and the hon. Member opposite had said that his Majesty's Government should have ascertained the grounds upon which that communication was made. An interview had taken place between himself and the Lord Mayor elect after the receipt of that communication, and if the information which had reached his Majesty's Government on the subject had been solely derived from him, Ministers would certainly have paused before they proceeded to act upon it; but the information received from the Lord Mayor elect had been confirmed by communications from at least twenty other different quarters. He thought that the Lord Mayor elect had acted perfectly right, and he must repeat that Ministers had not come to any resolution till after an interview had been had with the Lord Mayor subsequent to the receipt of his communication. He must also take that opportunity of saying, that he could never forget the honourable and candid conduct of the learned Gentleman opposite, (Mr. Denman) that evening; which did not, however, surprise him (Sir R. Peel), knowing as he did in common with every other person the high and honourable character of that learned Gentleman. He was gratified but not astonished at hearing the sentiments which that learned Gentleman expressed respecting the attacks upon the Duke of Wellington, as well as the brutal attacks made upon humbler but very useful individuals. They were sentiments which might draw down upon him some unpopularity —he spoke of unpopularity amongst the low and the vulgar; but they were the sentiments of all respectable and good citizens in the state.

SLAVERY.] On the Order of the Day for the bringing up the Report of the Committee of Supply being read,

Mr. *Brougham* said, that in consequence of a notice of a Motion which had been given by Sir G. Murray for the 11th inst., with regard to slave-evidence, after he had already given notice of a motion upon the general question of Slavery for the 25th inst., he was determined to move his resolutions on Wednesday next, if that notice of the Colonial Secretary should not be withdrawn.

Sir *R. Peel* was sure his right hon. friend had no intention to be discourteous to the hon. and learned Gentleman, and he could state that his right hon. friend had intimated to him before the meeting of Parliament, his intention to bring the subject under the notice of the House.

Mr. *Keith Douglas* requested, that the hon. and learned Gentleman would consider, that there were many interests involved in the discussion: that it was not a question between him and the Colonial Secretary, and therefore it was necessary for him to come to a specific resolution and give a specific notice.

Mr. *Brougham* said, that he should be down early to-morrow, and would endeavour to arrange the matter with Sir G. Murray.

INTERFERENCE WITH AFFAIRS OF BELGIUM.] Lord *Althorp* suggested, as it was most important that the country should be made acquainted with the plan of the Government with regard to the Civil List, that Mr. Hobhouse should postpone his motion for an Address relative to the interference of this country in the affairs of Belgium.

Mr. *Hobhouse* was most willing to take any suggestion from such a quarter, but the question was one of extreme importance; indeed with the exception of parliamentary reform, there was no question with regard to which the country was so desirous that the Parliament should at once come to a decision, and that they should pledge themselves in no manner whatever, to interfere in the affairs of foreign governments.

Mr. Brougham recommended the postponement to the Friday following.

Mr. *Hobhouse* declared it was his determination not to vote as a Member of Parliament a shilling to the Crown, if it was to be employed in interfering in the concerns of foreign States. He should probably fix his motion for Friday-week. He wished to take that opportunity to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Home Department, whether he had seen what had been stated in the newspapers, and, of course, correctly stated, as to conferences that were going on at the Foreign Office, to which the Austrian, Prussian, Russian, French, and English Ministers (the Dutch Ambassador had been invited, but was not able to go) were parties? If that were the case, he wished to know from the right hon. Baronet whether his Majesty's Ministers had assured themselves of the concurrence of the Provisional Government, established *de facto* in Belgium, in any arrangement to which those Powers in conference in Downing-street might come? He believed that he might assert, as a positive matter of fact, that the provisional government, which now held possession of the whole of Belgium, with the exception of the citadel of Antwerp and the fortress of Maestricht, would not permit any foreign Power to interfere by force or dictate to the Belgians what form of government they should select. He knew that to be the determination both of the government and the people, and he would recommend the right hon. Baronet to inquire from the parties themselves on the subject, and not to trust too much on such a point to the representations of any Ambassador. He did not wish to say any thing disrespectful of the French Ambassador, but there were circumstances connected with the history of Prince Talleyrand, which should make Government cautious in adopting any of the statements of that extraordinary man. He could assure the House that the Belgians would not submit to any dictation—French, Austrian, English or any other—with regard to the choice of their government. He was quite certain that those conferences in London, to which no Belgian envoy had been invited, so far from allaying the excitement in Belgium, would have the contrary effect. The Congress of Deputies which was to settle the form of constitution that Belgium was to adopt, were to meet to-morrow for the first time; and after verifying their powers, they would proceed to the business of arranging their constitution and deciding the form of their government. Why, then, did not the Ministers wait until the decision of that Congress was known? He threw out that hint for the adoption of his Majesty's Government. The conferences in London would occasion the greatest excitement in Belgium, and the Belgians would not submit to be dictated to, as to their form of government. They would not submit to be told that they should not have a republic, or that they should have this or that Prince of the House of Nassau. It was possible that they would not come to the resolution of having a Republic, but, judging from what he had heard from some of the deputies, it was more than probable that they would choose a republican form of government; and the very insisting on their not doing so would confirm them in that determination.

Sir *R. Peel* said, the hon. Member in postponing his Motion, had taken occasion to make a considerable portion of his speech. He wondered why the hon. Member had assumed that it was intended, on the part of the Ministers parties to the conference, to dictate to the Belgians as to what form of government they should select, or out of what family they should choose a sovereign. The first step which had been taken on the part of the conference, and which he was confident would meet with the approbation of the House and the country, was to endeavour, but not by dictation, to procure on both sides a cessation of hostilities. With respect to Prince Talleyrand, he did not know the motives which the hon. Member had for cautioning Government against him. He was accredited here by the King of the French, as the representative of his government; as such he had been received, and he (Sir Robert Peel) must say, in reference to that eminent individual, that there was not the slightest want of confidence in, or attention towards him, on the part of his Majesty's Government.

INTERCOURSE BETWEEN THE WEST INDIES AND AMERICA.] Mr. *Herries* moved the Order of the Day for the House to resolve itself into a Committee on the Act regulating the Intercourse between the West-Indian Islands and the United States of America, and the House having resolved itself into a Committee, he went on to say, that his object was, to make some changes in the Act regulating the commercial intercourse between the West-Indian possessions of this country, and the United States, with a view to establish a permanent system applicable to that part of our trade. The Act he proposed to amend was that passed in the year 1825, under the auspices of the late Mr. Huskisson; and his Amendments would relate to the schedule of protecting duties on the productions of our own country, and our own colonies, in exchange with each other, as compared with the imports into those colonies from foreign States. An event of considerable importance to the empire at large, and unquestionably to certain parts of our colonial possessions, had recently occurred, to which it was indispensably necessary that he should advert, in order to explain to the Committee the views under which he proposed the change in the schedule to which he had adverted; that event was the final conclusion of the point, long contested between Great Britain and the United States, as to the degree and manner in which the latter were to prosecute their intercourse with the West Indies. He had the gratification of being able to state, that a topic of discussion between two nations which had occupied the longest time, and was of the most intricate character of any within memory, and which had been subject to many variations of pretension on both sides, had now been amicably, and, he trusted, for ever, terminated to the satisfaction of both parties. Further, he had to inform the Committee that the adjustment had taken place on the basis, and without the slightest departure from that basis, of the Act of 1825, which laid down definitively the principles on which Great Britain would allow to foreigners a participation in the trade of her West-Indian possessions. It was well known to all, that the dispute upon this point had been carried on almost from the date when the United States ceased to be a component part of the British empire. The views of their Government on this subject, in the first instance, were very limited, and they were then willing to accept, as a sort of boon, what they had since claimed as a right; the British Government was then, and had ever since been willing to admit the claim upon any reasonable grounds; but various causes, from time to time, arose to impede the conclusion of the question by amicable convention. From 1794 the proposals of the British Government were continually rejected by the United States, and up to 1810 it was found impossible to effect any arrangement. During the war which subsequently ensued, a positive interdiction existed until 1815, excepting in cases when the governors of colonies were empowered, from time to time, to open the ports of the islands to the shipping of the United States. On the conclusion of peace this country reverted to her original principle of the exclusive possession of the trade of her own colonies. From that date until the present, scarcely a single year had passed without an infructuous attempt on the one side or on the other to settle the question. By what was known by the name of Mr. Robinson's Act a fair opening seemed offered for the arrangement of the commercial intercourse between the United States and the British Colonies; but the measures adopted in consequence by the republic were certainly not such as to render the Statute effective for the purpose for which it was passed. Since that date, the claims advanced by the United States in 1824, had been entirely retracted, or it was obvious that it would have been impossible to have fully and completely arranged the matter in dispute. They had unconditionally withdrawn their unfounded pretensions, and this country now stood on the footing it occupied in 1825, and which it announced to all the world it was determined to maintain. He was bound to add, and he should not do justice to the United States if he did not, that it was impossible for any government to conduct a negotiation, in which the most important interests of two countries were deeply concerned, in a more frank, straight-forward, conciliatory, and therefore, as he thought, politic, wise, and prudent manner, than the United States had conducted this negotiation throughout. He believed that on this occasion neither party had had the slightest reason to complain of the other, but both had just grounds of satisfaction and mutual confidence. Certain documents connected with this important question had already been laid upon the Table of Parliament, and others, to complete the series, would, of course, in due time be communicated. It was fit to state, in order that no undue impression might be made upon the mind of any individual, that in concluding this last and final arrangement, the present ministers had adhered, without exception, to the principles laid down by their predecessors in office, as expressed in those documents. The American government had not only abandoned its former principles, but had also satisfied the British Government, by producing the enactment under which the revocation of those principles was to take effect; and lest any ambiguity should arise, the most distinct explanations had been required on the one side, and given on the other. This country was thus called upon, by every consideration, to admit the United States to a participation in that trade from which they had hitherto been excluded. The law of 1825 was framed with a view that all nations should participate in it; and it was only the conduct of the United States which had hitherto prevented them from enjoying the benefits which others had reaped from participation. It must be satisfactory to the House to learn that all those matters in difference were now finally and completely set at rest; but it was, at the same time, indispensably necessary to consider what changes had occurred since the enactment of the schedule of duties—whether anything had occurred since 1825 to render those duties unfit for the purpose for which they were intended; viz. the due protection of our own colonial interests. The effect of the existence of non-intercourse between the West Indies and the United States had been, to create new channels of trade, and to raise up a new class of claimants to the protection afforded by duties; it had produced a circuitous intercourse by means of our own North-American colonies; and whatever might have been the intention of this country in 1825, it was necessary now to tell the United States, that as they were the cause of the change, they must abide by the consequences. The Act of 1825 contained the conditions of equality on which the trade was to be carried on, and it also contained the schedule of protecting duties; but all parties were at all times given to understand that the British Government reserved to itself the right of altering those duties without responsibility to any foreign State. To avoid the possibility of mistake, the claim to exercise this right had been especially impressed upon the government of the United States; no objection could, therefore, be raised by any party to the course he now wished to pursue, and, least of all, by that government which, from time to time, had changed its tariff just as suited its temporary views. He meant, therefore, to propose some not immaterial alterations in the schedule of duties, the chief object of which would be, to secure the interests of the British North-American colonies from suffering in consequence of the confidence with which they had embarked in speculations, and made investments, under the belief that the present system was likely to be of longer continuance. Whether our colonists could claim this protection as a strict right was a different question, but there was no doubt that Parliament ought to feel an earnest solicitude for their interests. One object of the schedule of 1825 was, to encourage the introduction into the West Indies of articles from our North-American colonies: it had succeeded, but, under the change of circumstances, it was now the business of this country to take off part of the duty on foreign shipping, which, to the present moment, had existed, and had operated against the United States. The circuitous trade through our North-American colonies had been encouraged by this Government, and such, as he had already remarked, was the design of the schedule. It was true, that the lower descriptions of grain and flour had never yet passed through those colonies: they had been derived from the United States; but lumber of every description, wood and staves—of the greatest importance to the West Indies—had been conveyed thither entirely from our North-American colonies. The schedule would, therefore, give increased protection to the Canadas for the carriage of those articles, and a protecting duty would be imposed for the maintenance of their interests: that duty would be merely an increase of the impost upon lumber; it was already 7*s.* per thousand staves, and he should propose that it be raised to 10*s.* 6*d.* per thousand. The planters would thus be furnished at as cheap a rate as they could reasonably expect, and the principle of the change would be, to afford that degree of protection which would balance the foreign supply, so as to give to the consumer as fair a competition as possible. The better mode would be, that he should lay before the House, in a printed form, a comparison between the two schedules, so that the House would at once perceive how the law stood now, and how he proposed that it should stand in future. That comparison was probably by this time printed; and the House would be aware that, in consequence of the distance, it was fit that no delay should occur, and that the new duties should come into operation at the date of the Order in Council which had already been issued. He could not refrain from observing, that these changes must operate considerably to the advantage of this country: he did not know that they would operate to the disadvantage of the United States, and he doubted if any country permanently gained by the commercial injury of another State. It seemed to him that much would be gained on both sides—to the shipping interests at home, as well as to our North-American possessions. It was to him a matter of the highest satisfaction to mark the growing prosperity of those colonies; among other recent benefits, they were drawing coal in some parts of Canada, of a quality of peculiar excellence, which they were longing to be able to export to the United States. A system of free intercourse must always be preferable to restriction, and the system he was about to recommend was far more beneficial than that which had so long existed. Was such a state, was the entire suspension of the intercourse between our West-Indian colonies and the United States, to be compared to that which he now had the satisfaction to see established. There was an important feature by which that schedule was distinguished from all former ones. It was this—that, in whatever territory the commodities introduced from our West-Indian islands into the United States may have been produced, they were to be admitted without any additional duty. The hon. Gentleman then referred to the comparative tables for the proof of the advantageous terms under which the produce of our West-Indian colonies will henceforth be received in the United States, and concluded by moving, that it was the opinion of that committee, that, "no duties be imposed on commodities, introduced into his Majesty's Colonies in the West Indies, from the United States of America other than those described in the schedule."

Mr. *George Robinson* would not trouble the Committee with any remark on the schedule proposed for the sanction of the Committee by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. But with respect to the hon. Gentleman's assertion, that all parties interested in the commercial prosperity of England, would receive with satisfaction the announcement of the new footing on which the intercourse of our colonies in the West Indies with the United States of America has been placed, he (Mr. R.) could not help observing, that there was one party deeply interested in the question, which would hear with great regret the change which the British Government had thought proper to make in that intercourse. He acknowledged that this was done in strict accordance with the policy of a statesman, whose loss he (Mr. R.) deplored as much as any man—but he would ask the right hon. Gentleman, if there had not been a decided change in the commercial policy of the United States of America, since the measures introduced by Mr. Huskisson in the year 1825? He asked if it had not been the policy of those States, according to the tariff since enacted, to exclude from their territory every article of British production? He would ask if this were the time to make a change in our commercial policy in favour of the United States, when, by the Tariff of 1828, our productions were virtually shut out from their territories? He insisted that it had always been the object of the United States to obtain that uninterrupted access to our colonies in the West Indies which Ministers had now conceded, without any adequate compensation. In his view the effects of the present measures would be, to throw the whole trade with the West-India islands into the hands of the United States, to the exclusion of our North-American colonies. By those measures the whole business of the shipping at present employed in the carrying trade between the Canadas and the British possessions in the West Indies, would be transferred to the commercial navy of the United States. But the right hon. Gentleman had told them that they had now made concessions which they refused in 1828. Those concessions, however, seemed to consist in their return to the duties existing before that time. When, by their refusal of the terms of reciprocity offered them, they found that their own commerce was injured, they strove to compensate their losses by the imposition of additional duties on British colonial produce. He remembered well, that the right hon. Gentleman formerly said, that the consequence of the American government persisting in that hostile policy might be, that we should be compelled to lay an impost on American raw produce introduced into this country; and the only question with the hon. Gentleman then was, whether we could impose such a duty consistently with our own interests? He recollected that in the correspondence between Mr. Canning and the minister of the United States (Mr. Galatin) that the former asserted, that, in consequence of the policy pursued by that government respecting the intercourse of the United States with our colonies in the West Indies, any alteration in duties to which American produce should be subjected, upon its importation into those colonies, must be effected by an Act of the British Legislature, and could not be effected by any treaty or convention. He (Mr. R.) insisted, that our colonies in North America had a right to complain that they were taken by surprise, when measures affecting their commercial interests so deeply were adopted suddenly, and without giving them any notice to prepare themselves for the change. At the time of the Treaty of Ghent, the merchants and other persons interested, were made acquainted before-hand with the changes which it was proposed to effect in the commercial relations of the States who were parties to that treaty. He would ask, why were British subjects in North America not considered entitled to a similar notice of changes seriously affecting their commercial interests? He gave the right hon. Gentleman credit for his not having disguised this important result of the proposed measure—namely, that the commercial interests of British subjects would suffer by it, and especially the shipping interest. He knew that it had been the policy of the government of the United States, in its anxiety to obtain for its commercial navy the advantages which it must derive from an extension of the intercourse between those States and our West-India colonies, to represent that both parties would gain by the extended intercourse. He never believed it. In consequence of the proximity of the West Indies to the coasts of the United States, every change in the West-Indian markets is known in the commercial towns of those States a month before the information can reach our North-American Colonies. In that way the Americans of the United States would have overwhelming advantages in the competition with the Canadian merchants. This measure, therefore, would go to destroy an important branch of our shipping interest, which had grown up within the last twenty years in New Britain, Nova Scotia, and the Canadas. The registered tonnage of the British West-India Islands, and of our North-American Colonies, had in one year increased by nearly 60,000 tons. The carriage heretofore had been exclusively by British ships, and that to the amount of one million tons, the greater part of which must, in the competition with the United States, to which the proposed measure would give rise, be transferred from the hands of our colonial merchants. In the course of a few years all the vessels engaged in the carrying trade between our North-American Colonies and the West-India islands must be laid up. That branch of the shipping interest, which hitherto had not suffered the same depression as the other branches of the British commercial navy, would be reduced to a condition of which it did not require the gift of prophecy to predict the results. Much stress had often of late years been laid, by hon. Gentlemen opposite, upon the improvements that had taken place in the Canadas. Immense sums of money had been granted by that House to push the prosperity of those colonies still further; canals had been constructed in them at a vast expense to this country; British subjects had been encouraged to transfer large capitals from the United Kingdom to the colonies, by official descriptions of their prosperity. He would ask, then, if the British capital now invested in machinery, in shipping, and in the agricultural improvement of the Canadas, were to be totally sacrificed? He was sure, that the moment the news of the measure now announced should reach those colonies, all speculation would be suspended, and instead of affording an asylum to the superabundant part of our population, the distresses resulting from the measures would necessarily aggravate the distresses of the empire at large. When the consideration of the question was pressed on the Government, in the time of Mr. Canning and Lord Dudley, it was declared that they would not consent to entertain it, unless the Americans should revise the Tariff of 1826. It could not, therefore, be said that we were now making the commercial changes in accordance with the views of the two statesmen (Mr. Canning and Mr. Huskisson), alluded to by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Herries), unless the American government had altered their whole commercial policy since the time of those statesmen. Would Mr. Canning or Mr. Huskisson consent to such changes, after the hostility which the American government had manifested to our interests? At the very moment when we were making such concessions in favour of the United States, they were acting on decidedly an opposite principle. Their whole scale of duties was one of prohibition, as regards the importation of British colonial produce. They had shown no disposition to concur in the liberal arrangements of this Government. He had some interest in the West-India islands; but he could not see that they would be benefitted by those changes which must, at all events, operate injuriously upon the North-American colonies. The United States could supply those islands with every article with which they were at present supplied by Great Britain, and by the Canadas; and thus that trade would be sacrificed, which it was the most desirable to maintain—the trade which consists in an interchange of superfluities between one part of the empire and another. He felt satisfied that the West Indies, in supplying America with rum and sugar, must lose entirely the trade they at present enjoy with our possessions in North America, and a great part of their trade with the mother country. In all our negotiations with the United States, the latter have had the advantage. He did not mean to say, that our Ministers were less talented as diplomatists than those of America, but they had exhibited less knowledge of the relative commercial interests of the two countries. The whole policy of the United States towards us had been one of restriction and prohibitions, while our policy had been, to open our trade to them, first that with our American colonies, then that with the United Kingdom, and lastly, that with the West Indies. He was willing to hope, that the present measure might prove as advantageous as was anticipated by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Herries), but he feared that not only would our shipping-interest be injuriously affected by it, even the West-Indian interests, which it was proposed to benefit, would suffer from it a considerable loss. The changes, if made at all, ought at least to be gradual; for sudden transition must bring on extensive and irretrievable ruin. The right hon. Gentleman had said, that as soon as the House should ratify the schedule then laid before it, the ports of America would, according to the President's Message, be thrown open to the introduction of our colonial produce, and he had urged that we should not delay to fulfil the required condition, as, in the mean time, we are continually losing by the imposition of the old duties. He believed, however, that we should be much greater losers by the exclusion of British colonial commodities from the West Indies, which must be immediately occasioned by the influx of American produce, which would be poured into those islands, under advantages with which our merchants could not compete. He hoped that Government would allow time for those whose interests would be affected by the change, to prepare themselves for the result. The changes which had heretofore been made in the commercial policy of this country had been introduced so suddenly as to involve in ruin all those who were concerned with the branches of trade affected by the alterations. The policy of Mr. Canning was very different, as shewn in his correspondence with Mr. Galatin, from that now recommended to the House. Mr. Canning had declared, that whatever change should be made in the intercourse between the United States and the West Indies, should be effected by an Act of the Legislature, and not by negotiation between the two governments. That statesman had always denied the right of every foreign government to make our internal and municipal regulations the object of its stipulations. Contrary to that declaration, the House was then called on to confirm a treaty, which Government had already ratified with the United States, to alter our colonial regulations. The House was only consulted as to the rate of duty; the Government had already decided upon the principle. He concluded by assuring the House, that in the statements which he had made he had not been influenced by prejudice; and that he should be glad to be corrected, if he were mistaken in his views.

Mr. *Keith Douglas* considered, that every regulation tending to extend the intercourse between the two nations, Great Britain and the United States, must give mutual confidence to the merchants of both. Gentlemen must be aware, that in this attempt to protect the peculiar interests of our North-American colonies, that protection must be purchased at the expense of other parts of the British empire. In consequence of the distressed condition of the West-Indian interest for some time past, the Board of Trade had investigated fully all the burthens borne by these colonies, and had inquired into the causes of their distress. The result of that inquiry had been, that no countervailing duties could be imposed for their relief; and the House was, therefore, called on to lighten the burthen to which they were subjected for the benefit of other parts of the empire.

Mr. *Herries* thought, that he had explained already that the West-Indian colonies would continue to receive without duty what they now received without paying a duty. The condition of the West-Indies must, at all events, be improved; and he did not conceive that the improvement would be effected at the expense of the North-American colonies. He could not agree with the hon. Gentleman opposite in his interpretation of the language of Mr. Canning. Having entered into treaties with the Spanish settlements in America, and with other countries, and when we found that the United States of America (the only country which was excluded from participation in the commerce with our colonies) were coming round, it did seem advisable to admit the United States to that trade on the same conditions on which it was enjoyed by other nations. The only question then to be considered was, whether the duties described in the schedule submitted to the House were sufficient for the protection of our colonial interests. If they were sufficient, the argument of the hon. Gentleman opposite fell to the ground. The principle on which they were founded was that of protection. The hon. member for Middlesex had said, that the proposed duties were too high; so that the whole question was now only one of degree.

Mr. *Keith Douglas* did not wish to enter then into details, but he objected, for one thing, to the increase of duty on shingles.

Mr. *Hume* said, that the Ministers had on the present occasion furnished an example of the folly of bringing forward a plan for the purpose of pleasing every body. They had succeeded in pleasing nobody. The West-Indians were dissatisfied, and the North-Americans were dissatisfied, and he was dissatisfied. The Government professed to act on the principle of free-trade; but the principle acted upon, in the practice, seemed to him to be that of making the colonies pay as dearly as possible for what they consumed. When a similar measure to that now before the

House was brought forward in 1825, he resisted it. He deprecated the plan of inducing people to believe at any time, that Government would persevere in upholding such monopolies as that hitherto possessed by the Canadas in the trade with our West-Indian colonies. He deprecated the policy by which the several parts of the empire were considered as having not one common interest, but distinct and even conflicting interests. He would contend most strenuously against the principle of the arrangements which it was the object of the present Motion to carry into effect. He did most sincerely hope, that his Majesty's Government would see the necessity of laying open the whole of the trade. For his part he could not let any opportunity pass of entering his protest against the monopoly of the West Indies; and as to what the right hon. Gentleman had said respecting the improved disposition of the present American government to treat with us, he saw no reason to complain of the conduct of former governments; at least, he saw no grounds for the assertion that the present government of America was at all more disposed to treat than any of its predecessors. He could not help expressing his surprise that any one could suppose that it would be beneficial to this country to adopt the American Tariff; at the same time it was to be observed, that the American duties did not amount to 100 per cent, while, if such a statement could be made, the duty imposed by the Government of Great Britain amounted in some cases, to 1,200 per cent; on tobacco, as the House knew, there was a duty to that extent imposed. Was there any hope that the Government and the Legislature would at any time arrive at the conclusion that we ought to have every foreign commodity at the lowest possible rate? Convinced as he was of that important truth, he could not but deprecate anything in the nature of retaliation; and he, therefore, with the deepest regret, heard the late lamented Mr. Huskisson, contrary to his usual practice, and in direct opposition to those principles which he attained his highest distinction by advocating, say that circumstances might arise in which it would be for the interest and advantage of this country to retaliate on foreign countries by imposing heavy duties on their productions. Those duties were neither more nor less than bounties; and surely no inconsistency could be more gross than the advocacy of free-trade, and the maintenance of bounties. It was well understood that the effect of those duties was, to prevent intercourse between the United States and our West-India colonies; that object was to be effected by protecting duties. Now to every sort of protecting duty he was opposed. If any duty were required for the purpose of revenue, let it be imposed; but let no duty be laid on for the purpose of protection, or in any respect for the purpose of acting as a bounty, and, least of all, for the purposes of maintaining a monopoly. The time had arrived when all monopoly should cease; but he saw with regret that his Majesty's Government was not impressed with the truth and importance of that principle. The measure before the House was neither one thing nor another; it was at best robbing Peter to pay Paul, taking from the West-Indies to give to Canada, while the abolition of monopoly would equally benefit all parts of the empire.

Mr. *Charles Grant* observed, that the subject before the House involved two questions—the first was, the great principle upon which the measure rested; the second was, what might be called its details, or rather the means by which the object in view was to be carried into effect. To the latter of these divisions he would not address himself; as to the former he had to observe, that in any discussion respecting it, he wished to look upon it as a great national and imperial question, not having for its object to benefit or injure any particular class, neither in our North-American nor our West-India colonies. They were not, as he conceived, then to enter upon a discussion of the principle established by the Act of 1822, and recognized by that of 1825—recognized upon an enlarged basis. Against the re-opening of any such question, he begged most distinctly to enter his protest. It was not to be made a question then, or at any time, whether or not their colonies were to be preserved in a flourishing condition, or whether means were to be taken by the Government of Great Britain for preserving relations of peace and amity with a great commercial country, allied to us by birth, and that ought ever to be united by the remembrance of a kindred origin; it was not to be then made a question whether we ought or ought not to cultivate friendly intercourse with a great nation, that was expanding itself over the vast continent of America; it was not to be mooted whether the laws of God or of nature could make us the natural enemies of such a people. There was no regulation favourable to commerce that we could make, which was not as essential to our own welfare as it could be to the welfare of the United States. The hon. member for Middlesex had spoken of the difficulties attendant upon negotiations; but as he (Mr. Grant) trusted that the present measure would close the chapter of negotiation upon this subject, he should be most unwilling to call upon the Government to retrace its steps, or renew discussions which he considered as so happily closed. The objects of the United States, as he apprehended them, had been most incorrectly stated in the course of that discussion; their demand was nothing less than requiring freedom to trade with our colonies upon the same terms as the mother country traded with those colonies. On three or four separate occasions the principle was avowed and acted on, both in 1822 and 1823. The object appeared to be, to induce us to abandon the advantages which we derived from the possession of colonies. It was not, however, to be endured, that any country should attempt to compel this to adopt any particular code of commerce, or to dictate to us the manner in which we were to deal with our own municipal regulations; but the period had at length arrived when the negotiation was to be closed, and it would be for the honour and interest of this country neither to suffer its dignity to be offended with impunity on the one hand, nor, upon the other, to cherish any acrimonious or vindictive feeling. He certainly regretted that any such feeling had existed between the two countries, and he was proportionally glad that a better feeling was growing up, and the restrictive system connected with it was in a fair way to be abolished. It was due to the Government of the country, however, to say, that it never opposed removing those restrictions, but it wisely refused to pledge itself, on the supposition that the American legislature might repent its noxious and peculiar restrictions. He regretted, certainly, that, in the execution of a measure justified by sound principles, and necessary to the West-India islands, any other part of his Majesty's dominions should suffer. He felt for the situation of the Canadians; at the same time he was not prepared to say that we ought to sacrifice, for the interest of Canada, the general interest of the colonies. He doubted whether the interest of Canada was so materially promoted by the restrictive system as some Gentlemen supposed. The right hon. Gentleman had said, that for twenty years we had been nursing Canada in a peculiar manner, and he seemed anxious that that colony should not have it in its power to say that it was without an advocate, and without a protector. But our excessive care had been more injurious than neglect. We had undertaken to encourage a peculiar colony, at an enormous expense to every other. The interdict now to be removed had, in some degree, had the effect of co-operating to produce that result. We had given heavy bounties on a particular species of production, and now we were annoyed by our own imprudence, and to continue those bounties longer would only render it more difficult and more dangerous to get rid of them hereafter. For the sake of Canada herself, therefore, the sooner we got rid of the system the better. As to the duties, he must observe, that peculiar injury had been inflicted on the West Indies. His right hon. friend had stated, that his principle of protection was, to hold the balance as even as possible. This was as much as to say, to give as little relief as possible. These were the objections he felt, but he must, at the same time, express his satisfaction as to the character of the measure itself.

Mr. *Bernal* said, it was quite a mistake to suppose that the present measure was anything in the nature of a boon; for it was not to be forgotten that the West Indies now derived a great portion of their staves and lumber from the United States, through the neutral island of St. Thomas. The consequence of the restrictions, however, had been, that the Americans would not take our rum and sugar, but required to be paid in hard cash. They had, since the restriction, established distilleries of their own, and no longer took the produce of the West-India islands. The measure was in no respect either a partial or a general concession; and to the West-India islands was merely equitable.

Mr. *Herries* explained, that he never asserted that it was a boon. The present measure arose out of a sincere desire on the part of his Majesty's Government to close the negotiation with the United States upon the broad principles of justice. It was never asserted, for a moment, that the Government had any other object in view than protection in framing the schedule; it never was done for fiscal purposes. Though averse from protection in the abstract, he could not, in the present instance, consider it in any other light than as highly expedient.

Mr. *Warburton* put it to the House whether 100 per cent *ad valorem* was a reasonable and moderate protection? That, however, was the protection given to the produce of Canada by this measure. The protection, therefore, which the right hon. Gentleman had alleged to be but moderate, was contrary to the soundest principles of political economy, inasmuch as it was a bounty given to the grower of the dearest article, at the expense of the consumer, who could procure it at a cheaper rate elsewhere but for the protection. He had frequently brought the subject of the loss to the country of our undue encouragement of the Canada timber-trade before the House, with the hope of inducing Ministers to institute an inquiry into it, with a view to a remedy, and should, in the present Session—say the 2nd of December—move for a Select Committee on it, unless some more influential Member took the matter upon him. He confessed, however, as he was an interested party, he should much rather see the matter in the hands of Ministers than undertake the task himself.

Mr. *Herries* said, the Committee to inquire into the affairs of Canada would probably be revived, which would answer all useful purposes.

Resolution agreed to.

Sheriffs (Ireland).] Sir *H. Hardinge* moved for leave to bring in a Bill for improving the Administration of Justice in Ireland. The Bill would relate chiefly to the office of Sheriff: it was one which had been introduced in the last Parliament, and which, owing to the abrupt manner in which the Session terminated, was dropped. The Bill which he intended to introduce would differ only in merely technical matters, and when it came to be printed, hon. Members would see, that the Bill was calculated to promote the object proposed; namely, an improvement in the Administration of Justice in Ireland, and for the better regulation of the office of Sheriff in Ireland.

Mr. *Rice* hoped some improvement would be effected in the mode of appointing Sheriffs in towns corporate. It was a reproach to the Irish Members that the Report upon the subject in question had remained so long a dead letter—they had now made a beginning, and he hoped that it would energetically be followed up. The abuses growing out of the present system were enormous, and reform was absolutely necessary.

Sir *H. Hardinge* said, that though there might be abuses in towns corporate, yet the Report did not allude to that subject.

Leave given.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, November 9.

Minutes.] On the Motion of the Earl of Shaftesbury. it was ordered, that no Petitions relative to private Bills, should be received after the 17th of March; nor any Reports from Judges on the subject of private Bills, after the 13th of April.

Petitions presented. For the abolition of Slavery, from Woodstock, by the Earl of Shaftesbury:—By the Earl of Carlisle, from Carlisle, Harrington, Dalston, Brampton, Keswick, Bolton, Chesterfield, Derby, and nine other places in Cumberland, Yorkshire, and Derbyshire:—By Earl Spencer, from Portsmouth, Portsea, Northampton, Gisborn, Milton, and five parishes in Northamptonshire:—By the Duke of Norfolk, from places in Armagh, Nottinghamshire, Gloucestershire, and an individual in Ireland:—By the Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, from Bridgenorth, Stafford, Newcastle-under-Lyme, and five places in Derbyshire:—By the Earl of Aberdeen, from the Incorporated Trades of Aberdeen:—By the Earl of Tankerville, from three parishes in Yorkshire:—By the Earl of Radnor, from East and West Grinstead, Sussex, Alderley, Aylesbury, Cowes, and several Parishes in Nottinghamshire:—By the Earl of Falmouth, from Truro, South Cove, and Grampound:—By the Marquis of Cleveland, from Durham, Middleton, and two other places in Durham:—By the Bishop of Bath and Wells, from Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Blackburn, Whitby, Stone, and several places in Lancashire, Somersetshire, and Yorkshire:—By Lord King, from Guilford, and another place in Surrey:—By Earl Grosvenor, from a Congregation in Manchester;—By Lord Calthorpe, from Oxford, a Female Congregation in Eagle-street, London, and several Parishes in the Shires of Derby and Monmouth. For the repeal of the Civil Disabilities under which the Jews labour, by Earl Spencer, from an individual. For a Revision of the Law of Arrest, by the Duke of Richmond, from Henry Thompson.

Distress of the Mining Interest.] The Marquis of *Cleveland* presented a Petition from the Lead-miners of Alston, a district of Cumberland, complaining of Distress, arising from the present state of the law relative to the importation of lead, and praying for relief. The noble Marquis expressed a hope that Government would pay attention to the allegations of the present petitioners, similar to that with which they had already honoured petitions of a like nature presented by him in the course of last Session. He was convinced that the condition of the manufacturers was progressively improving, and that the agriculturists were not now suffering such privations as they had experienced at the commencement of last Session, while the deplorable state of the mining interest continued unchanged. He therefore trusted that the promises which had been already conveyed to him by Government, respecting this important question, would ere long be realized.

The Earl of *Falmouth* observed, upon the distress sustained by those who were concerned in the iron and copper mines also, which he attributed to the importation of metal from South America. In 1825 companies had been formed to work the mines of that country with English capital, and bring the ore into competition, in the European market, with that raised in England. This was a serious injury to the extensive mining interests of this country. Application had been made to the noble Duke for protection, but he had afforded none to the mining interest. It was to be hoped, however, that he would re-consider this subject, and listen to the prayers of the miners.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, he had last Session come to the conclusion, that he should do much more injury to British interests by interfering, than by abstaining from interference. He could only repeat the assurance which he had already given the noble Marquis, that he would not be wanting, during the ensuing year, in attention to this, or to any other subject connected with the welfare of the country.

Petition to lie on the Table.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, Nov. 9.

Minutes.] Petitions presented. For the abolition of Slavery in the Colonies, by Mr. Whitmore, from Bridgenorth:—By Sir J. Mackintosh, from Knaresborough, and the Independents of New Court, Carey-street:—By Sir J. Wrottesley, from Leek, Staffordshire:—By Mr. Sykes, from the Dissenters of seven places in Yorkshire:—By Mr. Greene, from Lancaster:—By Mr. E. Clive, from certain Female Inhabitants of the City of Hereford:—By Mr. Wall, from Guildford:—By Lord Ebrington, from five places in Devonshire:—By Mr. O'Connell, from Dalreoch, Scotland:—By Mr. Pringle, from the Presbytery of Selkirk:—By Mr. Gisborne, from Stafford:—By Sir W. Foulkes, eight Petitions from Dissenters in Norfolk:—By Mr. Hume, from the Wesleyan Methodists of Harrow-on-the-Hill:—By Sir E. Kerrison, from the Borough of Eye:—By Mr. Pendarvis, from a Town of Cornwall:—By Mr. Mundy, eight Petitions from Dissenters in Derbyshire. By Mr. Shaw, from the Pastor and Members of the Congregation of Ebenezer Chapel, Harmony-row, Dublin, against Duelling. By Lord Morpeth, from James Hamilton, Barrister-at-Law, a landed proprietor, and a Magistrate of Yorkshire; and, he expressed in his Petition, "an ardent and persevering sportsman," for an alteration in the Game-laws, particularly as regarded qualification. By the same noble Lord, from Martin Stapylton, esq., praying that no Member should be allowed to sit and vote, until he had taken an Oath that he had not committed any breach of the Laws against Bribery and Corruption. By Mr. Alderman Thompson, from Mr. Capel and Mr. Gladstone, complaining of the Return at the late Election for Queenborough.

Mr. C. W. Wynn's Bill to Repeal so much of certain Acts as required certain Oaths to be taken before the Lord Steward, &c. was read a first time.

REPEAL OF THE UNION—PERSONALITIES.] Mr. O'Connell presented a petition from Waterford for a repeal of the Legislative Union with Ireland. The hon. Member supported the prayer of the petition.

Mr. *Doherty* wished to know from the hon. and learned Gentleman, whether it was his intention to bring the question to which the petition referred substantively before the House, so as to admit of a fair and full discussion, and thus give hon. Members an opportunity of expressing their sense of its merits? He thought this would be the fair and straight forward course for the hon. and learned Gentleman to pursue, instead of habitually indulging in irregular and vapid observations on the presentation of petitions.

Mr. *O'Connell* did not intend to bring forward a specific motion for the repeal of the Union till the number of petitions in its favour should show that the measure was one not emanating from individuals, but from the majority of the people of Ireland. He would take the opportunity of assuring his excellent friend, the member for Middlesex, that the repeal of the Union was no mere whim of his, but the ardent desire of 99 persons out of every 100 in Ireland.

Mr. *Doherty* said, that as the hon. and learned Gentleman had shrunk from affording the House a tangible opportunity of expressing a decisive opinion on the subject, he would in future abstain from any remarks relative to the repeal of the Union, on the occasion of petitions being presented. He recommended other hon. Members to pursue the same course, and await the opportunity, if ever it presented itself, of the hon. and learned Gentleman's bringing forward the question so as to admit the sense of the House being taken upon it.

Mr. *Tennyson* protested against the principle just laid down by the Solicitor-General for Ireland, that Members should abstain from addressing observations to the House when presenting petitions.

Mr. *Brownlow* earnestly hoped a day would be afforded for the full discussion of the subject; for he was sure that the House would be unanimous against the present project of the hon. and learned member for Waterford. Nothing could be more detrimental to the peace and the prosperity of Ireland than agitating this question.

Mr. *Shaw* could assure the House, that the great majority of his respectable and enlightened constituents—the inhabitants of the city of Dublin—were against the scheme of a repeal of the Leglislative Union with Ireland.

Mr. *O'Connell* had no other object in view in agitating the question of a local Parliament than to prevent the forcible separation of Ireland from England, and to add to the benefits of their union. The Union had long been an object of hatred to the people of Ireland. The Chief-Justice of the King's-bench in Ireland declared, that the Act of Union was a nullity, for the Parliament had no authority to pass it. The Chief-Justice of the Common Pleas, Ireland, Lord Plunkett, declared, that like Hannibal, he would bring his sons to the altar, and make them swear perpetual hostility to the measure. The great majority of the Irish people now called for its repeal, and he could assure his hon. friend (Mr. Shaw) that he was mistaken as to the opinions of his own constituents. The declaration against the repeal, got up in Dublin, had not been signed by more than a score persons.

Mr. *G. Dawson* maintained, that notwithstanding the perverse obstinacy with which the hon. and learned member for Waterford agitated the question of a repeal of the Union out of doors, for the sake of mob-popularity, he would not dare to bring it forward substantively before the House, so as to bring the favour in which it was regarded by hon. Members, of every shade and party, to a tangible and satisfactory test. It might answer the hon. and learned Gentleman's purposes, as the organ of the mob of Ireland, to make irregular speeches on the subject at dinners. and on presenting petitions, but it would not so well suit his views to enable the public to know that in that House he could not influence a single Member to vote or speak on his side of the question. The hon. and learned Gentleman professed, then, that his object was, to strengthen the Union between the two countries; but every one who had heard him knew that the question did not assume its present form till the recent transactions in Belgium invested it with a new character, so as to afford him a favourable opportunity of carrying on his old trade of agitation. To attain his own personal object, mob-popularity, the hon. and learned gentleman seemed to think all means legitimate. For example, he had lately stated that a venerable nobleman (Earl Fitzwilliam), eminently distinguished by those qualities befitting his rank and station, was about to expel 800 families from his estate in the county of Wicklow, under the authority of certain clauses of the Subletting Act. Now, what were the facts of the case? Why, a Gentleman, a Member of that House, Mr. Challoner, the member for York, whom Lord Fitzwilliam had appointed to be the agent of his Irish estates on account of his humane, intelligent, and truly gentlemanlike qualifications, declares, in a letter in one of the Irish papers, which he had read that morning, that it was impossible to give utterance to a "more gross falsehood." This Gentleman had been selected by the hon. and learned Gentleman as an object of his calumny and gross libel. The hon. and learned Gentleman, to be sure, might retract his expression, for he was well known to be in the habit of making assertions, and retracting them when pushed for an explanation. "I will not," said the hon. Member in conclusion, "repeat the strong language of Mr. Challoner with reference to the hon. and learned Gentleman's assertion; but this I will say to his face, that I do believe Mr. Challoner, and that I do not believe his assertion. He may, if he likes, take an opportunity of retracting his gross libel on Mr. Challoner; but I am sure that a candid public will deem his retractation and his assertion equally satisfactory."

Mr. *Hume* rose to protest against the extraordinary language which had been employed by the hon. Member who had just sat down. If the time of the House were to be thus uselessly taken up in stating objections to the conduct of hon. Members out of the House, there would be no end to the angry discussions which would inevitably arise out of such a practice. What right had the hon. Member to accuse his hon. and learned friend, the member for Waterford, of being an agitator in Ireland? that was not the question before the House, and his Majesty's Ministers and the Gentlemen connected with them, ought to be the last persons to encourage reproaches or make such attacks as that which the hon. Member had just made on the hon. member for Waterford. He likewise wondered how the hon. Member could venture to characterise a petition signed by 7,000 or 8,000 freeholders as the petition of a mob. Against such language he would always strenuously and seriously protest. He submitted, that the hon. Member, if he thought that he had any complaint to urge against the hon. and learned member for Waterford, ought to bring it forward at once in a direct manner, and to substantiate it, if he could, to the satisfaction of the House. He had last night called on those who had charges against the Ministers to bring them forward, and in that same spirit he ought, if he had any charges to urge against the hon. member for Waterford to state them to the House on a specific motion, not waste the time of the House by attacks that were irrelevant, made in language that was certainly not very usual, and, he believed, not parliamentary.

Sir *Robert Bateson* said, that he rose for the express purpose of denying the statement which had just been offered to the House by the hon. and learned member for Waterford. He had the honour of representing a constituency as numerous, as loyal, and as respectable, as that of the hon. and learned member himself. And he also appeared in the House quite as independent as the hon. and learned Member. The present question was neither a Whig nor a Tory question,—neither a Ministerial nor an Opposition question. Every man could, therefore, discuss it without the slightest reference to party feelings. He could affirm, that not merely nineteen out of every twenty, but ninety-nine out of every hundred persons among his constituents were opposed, not only to the repeal of the Union, but also to the very agitation of such a question. That was the opinion of all the people throughout Ulster. He wished to tell the English Members distinctly, that 99 out of every 100 persons in Ulster were opposed to the very agitation of the question for the repeal of the Union. In the face of the assertions of the hon. and learned member for Waterford, he declared, that the mere agitation of it had produced great mischief in Ireland. Let the hon. and learned Member, who was never tired of vaunting of the benefits which his exertions had conferred upon Ireland, explain to his country, if he could, the benefit which he had conferred upon her by stopping the flow of English capital to her shores, and by preventing the improvement of her agriculture, her manufactures, and her commerce, which that influx of capital would inevitably cause. That was the mischief which the hon. and learned Member had done by agitating the question of the repeal of the Union. He rose to make these observations, because, after the broad and unqualified assertion of the hon. and learned member for Waterford, that all the people of Ireland were favourable to the repeal, he could not refrain from meeting it with as broad and unqualified a contradiction. He would repeat, that all the property, all the intelligence, all the respectability, and all the independence of Ireland, were opposed, not only to the repeal of the Union, but even to any agitation of the question. He had entertained expectations that a season of repose and quiet was coming for Ireland; but those expectations were fast disappearing, for there were some men, unfortunately, of great influence, who could not live, except in the elements of confusion. If this question of the repeal of the Union were to be set afloat,—if the example of Belgium were to be held up to Ireland as worthy of her imitation,—if factious demagogues were to be sent up and down Ireland, regardless of character, regardless of principle, and regardless of any offences they might commit, provided they could only agitate the mob to rebellion,—it was time for independent country gentlemen to come forward and endeavour to disperse the wilful delusions which the agents of mischief were propagating. With regard to the observations which had just fallen from the hon. and learned member for Middlesex, he would only remark, that he had as good right as that hon. Member to express his opinion in that House upon the conduct of public men and public measures. There was no other man in that House against whom such imputations could be made, as those which were made against the hon. and learned member for Waterford; for that hon. and learned Member had certainly contrived to signalize himself by his singularities.

Mr. *Shaw* said, that the hon. and learned member for Waterford had represented him to have drawn a distinction between the respectability and the numbers of his constituents. He had done no such thing. He had said, and he repeated the words, that a great majority of his constituents, both in respectability and in numbers, were opposed to the repeal of the Union. He was happy to say, that upon that point Protestants and Roman Catholics, Orangemen, and Anti-Orangemen, were perfectly agreed.

Captain *O'Grady* wished to give the House some information respecting the opinion which was prevalent in Ireland as to the repeal of the Union. There was a prevailing sentiment in Ireland to make the question of the repeal of the Union a question of agitation in that country, in the hope of gaining thereby some measures favourable to its interests. Many persons, who would shrink from the task of agitating that question for its own merits, were prepared to agitate it as a mode of accomplishing other objects of importance to Ireland. It might be true that, before the Union, there were forty tax-gatherers in Ireland where there was only one tax-gatherer now; but then that tax-gatherer was an Irishman. Every Irishman had since been removed from office, on pretence of assimilating the mode of keeping accounts in the two countries; and now tax-gatherers, and all other public officers, were Englishmen. This circumstance produced and fostered in the breasts of Irishmen a feeling of hostility against England, which they gratified by agitating the repeal of the Union.

The petition read.

Mr. *O'Connell*, in moving, that it be printed, said, that he should not complain of the treatment which he had received from two persons; for in very truth he was proud of the attack which had been just made upon him by the present and the ex-member for Londonderry. He would tell the hon. member for Londonderry (Sir R. Bateson) that he was signalized by one singularity—he was that hon. Member's inferior when he was called to the Bar—now he was his equal. That equality he had extorted from those who were unwilling to concede it, and in the teeth of as foul a conspiracy as had ever been formed to crush the cause of civil and religious liberty. As to the ex-member for Londonderry (Mr. G. Dawson) he had little to say to him, except to ask him how much of the public money he had received in his time? Had he not put the public money into his pockets by shovels full? The ex-member for Londonderry had shewn the most lamentable ignorance upon two points. The ex-member for Londonderry had told the House that the subject of the repeal of the Union had not been put forward at all in the last elections. Now the fact was, that he (Mr. O'Connell) had put it forward himself in the very first address which he had published to the electors of Waterford. The ex-member for Londonderry had also stated, that before the Union, we had in Ireland forty tax-gatherers where we now had one. Even if it were so, they were Irishmen; but he denied the fact. Did the ex-member for Londonderry know what the debt of Ireland was before the Union? It was only 16,000,000*l*., whilst her revenue was 1,400,000*l*. Did he know that up to that period there was no country in Europe so lightly taxed as Ireland? Was that the case at present? Here's a man who has been in the Treasury forty years, and is still ignorant of the taxation of Ireland. The House had heard the manner in which that man had addressed him. He knew the reason of it, and was glad that he had excited his hostility. He had mentioned the amount of money which that man had wrung from the public. Now, with all his money, what good had he ever done his country? Let him look at his entire life and say, what good had he ever done for either England, Scotland, or Ireland?—ay, he would throw him in the Isle of Man into the bargain. Would the ex-member for Londonderry venture to ask the same question of him? The ex-member for Londonderry had then introduced the name of Earl Fitzwilliam into the discussion. Now he (Mr. O'Connell) had never said that Earl Fitzwilliam's agent had ejected 800 families. All that he said was, that he had ejected 800 persons. And when the ex-member for Londonderry read that pointed, but "exceedingly cautious-in-assertion" letter of Mr. Challoner,—for Mr. Challoner only denied that ejectments had been served upon 800 families, and did not state how many ejectments he had served,—he ought to have done him (Mr. O'Connell) the justice of reading his letter in answer to it. In his answer he stated, that he had never said 800 families,—no newspaper even reported him to have said so,—and he now repeated what he had formerly said,—that there were 800 persons, upon Earl Fitzwilliam's estate, under notice to quit on the 1st of May. [*Cries of "No, no."*] He said that a farm of 800 acres was to go into lease on the 1st of May next: there were sixty families upon it, consisting of about 300 persons; these had all got notice to quit, as Mr. Challoner had disposed of the farm to a person of the name of Singe. He had now disposed of 300 persons out of the 800. He had got details from two clergymen as to the remaining cases, into which he should not enter at present. He begged leave also to remind the House, that he was not imputing blame to Earl Fitzwilliam or his agent, when he mentioned these cases, [*Cries of "oh!"*] but was speaking of the consequences of the Subletting Act. Did hon. Gentlemen think to put him down by assailing him with broad and unmannerly contradictions? If they did, they were utterly mistaken in their man. The sitting member for Londonderry had told the House, that his constituents were almost to a man opposed to the repeal of the Union. He (Mr. O'Connell) had never said, that that question was popular in the north of Ireland. He knew, however, that the people of three provinces had declared themselves decidedly in its favour. He knew also that it was gaining ground in the north of Ireland, for a newspaper at Newry, which had originally been opposed to the repeal of the Union, had recently changed its opinions, in deference to the popular sentiments prevailing in the neighbourhood. He was not acquainted with the hon. Member's constituents, but he understood that they were a pugnacious race, who built

> " ———Their faith upon
> The holy text of pike and gun."

He understood, that after some Roman Catholics had surrendered to them, and given up their arms on the express condition that their lives should be saved, they had done what? given the Catholics protection? No; they had done this [*The hon. Member drew his hand significantly across his throat*]. But he would not pursue that feud further; he wished it to be forgotten. He had heard four or five Gentlemen speak that evening in defence of the Union; but, strange to say, not one of them had pointed out a single good which it had done. The ex-member for Londonderry had called the electors of Waterford a mob. He denied the truth of that assertion in the strongest terms that the decorum of parliamentary language would permit him to use. There never was anything asserted—he would not say by the hon. Gentleman, but—by the lowest person in the most degraded rank of society, more groundless and untrue. His constituents were nine-tenths of them equal to the ex-member for Londonderry in rank, and all vastly superior to him in intellect. He would not demean himself by entering into a comparison of his own merits with those of the ex-member for Londonderry. He (Mr. O'Connell) had had the honour of receiving an offer to return him to Parliament from three counties in Ireland—an offer made, too, by persons who could have performed it, as they proved by returning Members who had pledged themselves to act upon his principles. He (Mr. O'Connell) had given up the representation of a fourth county; and a fifth county, as they all knew, had sent him to Parliament. No man in the House could pair with him in that respect, certainly not the ex-member for Londonderry, for he had been turned out of his county. The ex-member for Londonderry had taunted him with representing an Irish mob, but the ex-member himself represented nothing Irish; and he (Mr. O'Connell) was glad of it. He (Mr. O'Connell) could have come in for five counties. The ex-member for Londonderry was turned out of his own county; he tried to take refuge in another and failed—tried again at Merchants'-hall, failed there too—and then left his country, and took refuge in an English rotten borough. And yet that man—that clerk in a public office, with an extravagantly large salary for doing nothing—came forward to calumniate him—him, disinterestedly and independently chosen by the people of Waterford; for who could expect to receive favours or patronage at his hand? The freeholders of Waterford selected him because they knew that he was an object of hostility to all who entertained views hostile to Ireland; because they knew that he was marked out for the rancour of every little mean and contemptible mind. He would take care not to disgrace their choice. He would never tire in doing his duty to his country. Ireland deserved well of all her sons. The curse had been on her long. In the words of the Chief Justice of the Irish Common Pleas, he would say that Ireland had never wrung any boon from the grasp of England, which England had not parted with as reluctantly as if it had been her heart's blood. He would imitate the glorious example of the Brownlow of 1782—of that man, on whose tomb was inscribed the proud epitaph, that he had found his country enslaved, and had left her free,—of that man, whose name could not receive greater lustre, unless the Brownlow of 1830 should join with him and procure the repeal of the Union. He had that evening been assailed by language that was as low, mean, and creeping, as the source from which it came. He hailed it as his richest reward—as his highest encomium. "Ye placeholders, who revel on the hard earnings of the people," said Mr. O'Connell, addressing the Ministerial benches; "ye pensioners, who subsist on the public money; ye tax-consumers and tax-devourers, assault me as you please. I am not to be intimidated by you. I shall continue to stand by Ireland; for I represent her wants, her wishes, and her grievances." The hon. Member concluded by expressing his hopes that, as he was born in an independent country, he should not die until he had left her in possession of an independent Legislature.

Lord *Althorp* said, that the hon. and learned member for Waterford had made a statement regarding the conduct of Earl Fitzwilliam, which rendered it necessary for him to say a few words in contradiction of it. In order to give full effect to that contradiction, he felt himself called upon to lay certain details before the House, not merely by the respect which every man of proper feeling must entertain for so venerable a character as Earl Fitzwilliam, but also by the special request of his noble friend, Lord Milton, who was prevented by a severe domestic calamity from attending in his place. He would state to the House all that Earl Fitzwilliam and Lord Milton knew and believed upon the subject, derived as their knowledge and belief were from agents whom they had sent to acquire information concerning it. That information enabled him to contradict the hon. and learned Member's assertion, that 800 persons had been ejected from Earl Fitzwilliam's estate, as completely as Mr. Challoner had already contradicted his assertion about 800 families. [*Immense cheering followed this declaration*]. His noble friend, Lord Milton, had sent him up word that he had received information from his father's agent, Mr. Challoner, that there were only four families under notice to quit upon the whole of Earl Fitzwilliam's estates in Ireland. Three of them held about thirty acres together in common—in *conacre*, he believed, was the phrase in Ireland. The other man's family was in a different township from that mentioned by the hon. and learned member for Waterford. They were not under notice to quit owing to any wish on the part of Earl Fitzwilliam to enforce severely the provisions of the Subletting Act, but because they had lately been much in arrear for rent, some of them owing as much as four years' rent. Such were the results of an inquiry which Earl Fitzwilliam and Lord Milton had expressly ordered to be made in Ireland, in consequence of the unqualified assertions of the hon. and learned member for Waterford. He had received this information from his noble friend, Lord Milton, on Saturday last. He knew that Mr. Challoner was at present with his Lordship, and every man who knew anything of that Gentleman's character, must be convinced that he would have corrected any errors, had there been any errors to correct, in the information his noble friend had derived from the agents he had purposely sent to Ireland. In conclusion he observed, that he had no doubt that, if the hon. and learned member for Waterford would make further inquiries into this matter, he would find that he had been misinformed as to the circumstance of 800 persons having been ejected from the estates of Earl Fitzwilliam.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that the documents with which he had been furnished, made a very different impression upon his mind from that which had been made upon the mind of the noble Lord by the information furnished to him by Earl Fitzwilliam. He could not lay the documents which had been sent to him on the Table of the House; but he was ready to submit them at any moment to the inspection of the noble Lord. In conclusion, he repeated, that he had not, when he mentioned the fact, made any imputation against either Earl Fitzwilliam, Lord Milton, or their agent, Mr. Challoner.

Mr. *G. Dawson* said, that he did not intend to indulge the House, upon this occasion, by entering upon that kind of personal altercation which the hon. and learned member for Waterford had introduced into this discussion. Whatever that hon. and learned Gentleman might please to say regarding the public character and public services of so humble an individual as himself, he was at full liberty to say it, both in that House and elsewhere, and he certainly should never complain of his observations. "I therefore did not hear with any indignation (said the hon. Member) the observations which he made on my being a clerk in a public office, with a large salary, because I knew, that to be the object of such observations is the fate of every man who holds public office, and because I feel that it is language which he is liable to hear at any time from a man of vulgar mind and mean ideas. But when the hon. and learned Member indulges in aspersions on my private character—when he states as a reflection upon me that I am no longer the Representative of Derry, though he knows that I lost my seat for conscientiously supporting his claims as a Roman Catholic to emancipation, and for assisting to give him privileges which he now uses to promote agitation in Ireland—when he presumes (and I use that word advisedly) to touch upon my private conduct, I have a right to say thus much at least to him, that I have had the misfortune in my time to receive his praises and encomiums, and that I have now, thank God, the good fortune to be made the object of his calumnies and his slanders. He knows well that he dared not have uttered a tenth part of the calumnious falsehoods which he has vomited against me, if he had not determined to cover himself with the mantle of a most disgraceful indemnity. [*Loud cheering, and cries of* "*Order*," *from the Chair*]. Well, I will pursue that subject no further. I will only say, that I despise anything that the hon. and learned Member can say of me as much as it is possible for one man to despise the opinion of another." Before sitting down, he wished to notice one of the observations which had fallen from the hon. member for Limerick, respecting the number of Englishmen holding situations in the Tax-office in Ireland. If that complaint were made in Ireland, he could assure the hon. Gentleman that a very different complaint was made in England, and that was, that in the Customs and Excise too many situations were given away to Irishmen. He hoped that the hon. members for Limerick would weigh one of these complaints against the other, before he allowed his mind to receive any prejudice against the Union.

Mr. *Grattan* was understood to bear his testimony to the kind and paternal feelings of Earl Fitzwilliam to his tenantry in Ireland, and to the exemplary manner in which Mr. Challoner, as his Lordship's agent, watched over and promoted their local interests. He believed that, in consequence of a provision in the Subletting Act,—which he should be most glad to see entirely repealed,—it was necessary to give notices to quit to all persons on a farm, when a new lease of it was granted. Thus it might happen that notices to quit might be served on many families residing on Mr. Singe's farm, whom there was no intention of removing from their tenements. He had passed some days at that gentleman's house, and he must say that he never saw a more happy and contented peasantry than the 300 persons who were said to have been ejected from his farm.

Sir *H. Hardinge* said, that he, too, had been desired to offer a few words to the House in contradiction of another statement of the hon. and learned member for Waterford. Archdeacon Trench had commissioned him to inform the House, that the hon. and learned Member had been guilty of a most gross exaggeration when he stated that Lord Rathdrum had served notices to quit upon 400 or 500 individuals on his estates. Instead of 400 or 500 notices, he had only served four, or at most five, notices upon his tenants; and during the last three years only ten persons had been discharged from his property.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that with regard to Lord Rathdrum, he had never mentioned the number of notices which he had served upon his tenantry. He had not specified any number. He was informed, however, that those persons were ejected because they were not of the same religious persuasion with their landlord.

Sir *H. Hardinge*:—Archdeacon Trench has authorised me to contradict that statement likewise.

Mr. *O'Connell*:—It can, however, be proved.

SLAVE EVIDENCE.] Mr. *Brougham* rose to complain of the extraordinary waste of time which had been consumed in these irrelevant discussions. He was sorry to say that, during the present Session, he had heard language used every day in that House which he was sure would not be tolerated in any other house in the metropolis. He seldom came into the House without hearing the lie bandied, more or less directly, from one side of it to the other. Now if it were of importance for them to preserve the dignity of their proceedings, they ought to put a stop to such conduct. Conceiving the present discussion to be closed, he would now take the liberty of asking the hon. Secretary for the Colonies whether he would have any objection to postpone the introduction of his bill, to render slave evidence admissible in the colonies until after he (Mr. Brougham) had brought forward his Motion on West-India slavery?

Mr. O'Connel rose to reply—but the Speaker decided that he had no right to reply.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that he would speak, then, in explanation.

The *Speaker*:—The hon. Member will be good enough to confine himself strictly to explanation.

Mr. *O'Connell*:—All he had to say was this,—namely, that the personalities had been commenced against him, and not by him. He appealed to those around him if this were not the fact.

Sir *G. Murray* (in reply to Mr. Brougham) consented to postpone his Motion, of which he had given notice, with regard to slave-evidence in the colonies.

TRUCK SYSTEM—MISREPRESENTATION.] Mr. *Littleton* rose, for the purpose of presenting a Petition against the Truck-system. He trusted that the House would allow him to take this opportunity of noticing a passage in a speech which had been made at a parish meeting in Ireland, by the hon. and learned member for Waterford. He need hardly say that this passage contained a reflection on himself; and, although he did not think that any disapprobation, coming from the hon. and learned member for Waterford, was likely to injure his character, yet, as a public man, he felt it necessary to notice it, and to expose the misrepresentation. On one evening towards the close of the last Session of Parliament, when a bill which he had introduced respecting the truck-system stood for committee, the hon. and learned Member came across the House to him and said, "Your bill stands for to-night; I shall vote against it, because it is against my principles; but I should not have spoken against it if you had not included Ireland in it; have you any objection to leave Ireland out of the bill?" To this observation and to this question from the hon. and learned Member, he (Mr. Littleton) carelessly replied, but in words which he perfectly recollected, "Well, I do not care about Ireland." By this expression he meant, as he was sure every Gentleman he was addressing must see, that he did not think it essential that Ireland should be included in the measure, and that he was, therefore, willing to accede to the request of the hon. and learned Member. It appeared almost impossible that any one could have misconstrued his meaning. The hon. and learned Member, however, received his observations with a smile, which excited in his mind, and in the minds of many of his hon. friends who were then sitting around him, a suspicion that his words would be misrepresented. He was particularly careful, therefore, on that very evening, to explain to the hon. and learned Member what he had meant by the expression which he had thus carelessly used. Thus, he had supposed that all misconstruction of his meaning, and that the misrepresentation he had suspected, would have been avoided. But let the House see how he had been treated in this matter by the hon. and learned Member. At a parish meeting in Dublin, the proceedings of which were reported in the *Dublin Evening Post* of the 23rd of October, the hon. and learned Member, after speaking of the manner in which English Members performed their duty with regard to Ireland, said, "One of them, Mr. Littleton, the member for Staffordshire, brought in a bill respecting the truck-system:" the hon. and learned Member then made some observations respecting that system, which it was unnecessary that he (Mr. Littleton) should trouble the House with reading, and the hon. and learned Member continued thus:—"I expostulated with him on the subject, and told him that I would not stand between the operatives of England and their employers; but I requested that Ireland might not be included in the bill, for that, in Ireland, the evils complained of in England had not been experienced from the system. What reply did he make me? It was this—'What do I care about Ireland?' Good Gentleman, said I, I shall take care to tell the people of Ireland how little English Members care about Ireland." Now was this consistent with fair dealing? Was it necessary that he, after eighteen years' service in Parliament,—after having been the first to introduce into that House a measure with regard to the elective franchise of the Catholics, after having, upon every occasion, though at much risk and inconvenience, done all he could to advance the interests of the Catholics,—was it necessary that he, after such conduct, and after the manner in which he had always carried himself upon questions relating to Ireland,—was it necessary, he asked, that he should rise up in that House and vindicate himself against the charge of caring nothing about Ireland,—of being altogether insensible to the interests of the Irish people? He did not believe that any hon. Member, with the single exception of the hon. and learned member for Waterford, and even of that hon. Member he would not have believed it unless he had seen it in print, could have given utterance to a charge so unjust, so utterly unfounded, and so injurious to his character. He begged pardon for having trespassed thus long, he hoped not unnecessarily, upon the attention of the House.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that he had been a good deal astonished at the warmth of the hon. Member; for, as it appeared to him, by the hon. Member's own showing, he had merely repeated the expression which the hon. Member acknowledged he had used ["*No, no*".] Was he, then, still labouring under some extraordinary misconception? The hon Member's expression to him was, "What do I care about Ireland" ["*No, no*"]. Well, then, would the hon. Member be good enough to state once more what the expression was which he had used upon the occasion referred to?

Mr. *Littleton* said, that the expression he had used was, "Well, I do not care about Ireland;" and he had already explained, he hoped satisfactorily to the House, the manner in which he had used it.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, was this, then, the distinction intended to be drawn,—the distinction between the expression "What do I care about Ireland?" and the expression, "I do not care about Ireland." The words of the hon. Member were still ringing in his ears. By those words the hon. Member appeared to him to throw off Ireland altogether, his mind being entirely taken up with his English constituents. He thought that the hon. Member, in using those words, meant to cast off Ireland with contempt; and he was very sorry if he had misunderstood the hon. Member.

PUBLIC RELIEF FOR THE POOR.] Mr. *Portman* begged to ask a question of the right hon. Secretary opposite, which appeared to him to be very material in the present state of the realm. It was well known that this metropolis, and a portion of the country, were in a state of great excitement. Many attempts had been made in that House to ameliorate the condition of the poor, and, under existing circumstances, he could refrain no longer from asking his Majesty's Ministers whether they had any measures to propose, and at what time they meant to propose them, with the view of relieving the extreme pressure of the lower, and also of the middling classes, who, in consequence of that pressure, were unable to employ as many of the labouring poor as they wished to employ. If Ministers had no such measures in contemplation, then individuals, however humble, must call upon Parliament to assist them, and to support them in their endeavours to effect this object.

Sir *R. Peel* said, he must protest against this course of asking, day after day, questions with regard to the measures contemplated by the Government. It must be evident to every hon. Member, that scarcely any measure could be proposed which would not, directly or indirectly, affect the condition of the labouring poor. Was it possible, then, that he could enter into the details which an answer to the question of the hon. Member must necessarily lead him into. The hon. Member had mentioned the metropolis; did the hon. Member mean to inquire whether the Ministers had in contemplation any partial measure; or, did the hon Member. refer to general measures?

Mr. *Portman*:—To general measures.

Sir *R. Peel* said, that an answer to such a question would include details which the House, he was sure, would not expect him to be prepared to enter into. He was ready to give a specific answer to any specific question; but, with all the respect he entertained for the hon. Member, he must refuse to attempt to satisfy the hon. Member on a subject so general as that to which the hon. Member's question referred.

Lord *Althorp* said, that the right hon. Gentleman seemed to have misunderstood the question of his hon. friend. His hon. friend meant to ask merely, whether the Ministers intended to propose any measures for the relief of the labouring poor. It was not intended to ask the right hon. Gentleman to enter into any details. He thought the country would be very much disappointed if it went forth, that the Ministers did not intend to submit to Parliament any measures for the relief of the labouring poor, for that was a subject of the deepest importance, and one that called for the especial consideration of the Government, and of the Parliament. This subject had hitherto been left to individual Members of the House, and the difficulty individual Members had met with in prosecuting their task had made every Gentleman lament that Government did not take this important subject into their own hands.

Mr. *Slaney* concurred in the view which the noble Lord had taken, and hoped the Government would attend to his recommendation. He was convinced, from long acquaintance with the subject, that unless the Government were speedily to take it up, the most disastrous consequences would ensue.

Sir *R. Peel* hoped he had said nothing from which it could be inferred that he was indifferent to the condition of the labouring poor, or that he was insensible to the deep importance of the subject. Was it not, however, clear, that almost every measure must affect their condition? Did not the remission of the Beer-duty affect the condition of the labouring classes? Would not the passing of Irish vagrants, and any measure for the employment of the Irish poor at home, and thus preventing their immigration into this country, affect the condition of the labouring poor? How, then, could he answer a question so complicated as that of the hon. Member? He thought the hon. Member must himself see the impossibility of this. He wished, however, most studiously to guard himself against the possibility of its being thought that he differed from the hon. Member, or from the noble Lord, as to the importance of the subject to which the hon. Member's question related.

Mr. *Portman* begged to remind the right hon. Secretary, that although he did not wish to precipitate measures, delays were sometimes very dangerous, and that the people might become desperate.

Sir *R. Peel* said, he really thought that this subject would be much better dealt with by individual Members of that House than by the Government. Why should not some Gentleman, who from experience was acquainted with the wants of the labouring poor, introduce a measure on the subject? If the hon. Member himself, who was so competent to form a judgment on the subject, would propose any measure, or any inquiry which might lead to a practical result, he (Sir R. Peel) would be most happy to co-operate with him.

Mr. *Portman* said, he must decline the challenge which the right hon. Secretary had given him, because he thought it the duty of the Government to bring forward a measure on the subject.

Sir *J. Wrottesley* concurred in the view taken by the hon. Member (Mr. Portman) near him. He would take that opportunity of observing, that the subject required immediate attention. The disturbances which had taken place in a neighbouring county, and which were extending to other places, must be instantly looked to. Much of the early part of his life had been passed among tumults, and he knew from experience that there was no more effectual way of quelling disturbances than for the Government to give to the local authorities more assistance when their ordinary force was not sufficient. The maxim *obsta principiis* was never more applicable than in the case of tumults: they would spread over the whole kingdom if they were not crushed at the commencement. The Government, however, must go further, and endeavour to remove the causes of discontent. He was, therefore, by no means satisfied with the answer of the right hon. Secretary. Individual Members could do little without the co-operation of the Government, and a subject of so much importance as the condition of the labouring poor could not be efficiently dealt with except by the Government itself.

Sir *Robert Peel* thought it would be a great advantage if conversations and remarks of the nature which had just been made, were preceded by some notice, and he must be allowed to observe, that the remarks of the hon. Baronet who had just spoken, seemed to convey some reproach upon his Majesty's Government for supineness with reference to the late disturbances—a reproach the most entirely unfounded that could possibly be uttered. It was extremely difficult at one and the same time to enforce the strictest economy, and exercise the energy that should belong to the governing power in any State. Infantry and cavalry were to be disbanded, scarcely a soldier was to be allowed in aid of the civil power—Government were compelled to dismiss the yeomanry; and when disturbances arose, they were told that they ought not to leave them to be suppressed by the constables, but ought instantly to crush them with a strong hand. He would call upon the hon. member for Kent to say, if his Majesty's Government had not done all, under the circumstances, which could be expected of it for the suppression of those disturbances? He had further to state, that though at a great public inconvenience, and to the neglect of other pressing matters, the Secretary for the Treasury was at the present moment at Maidstone, endeavouring to trace the causes of that extraordinary mystery which had, up to the present moment, eluded their most careful investigation; there were also at Maidstone every police officer, who in the present state of the metropolis, could be spared. To this he had to add, that he had authorized the Lord Lieutenant of the county to call out, and embody the yeomanry rather than resort to the regular military force. It would be a gross error to suppose that the disturbance in a neighbouring county was local. Its object, he could have no doubt, was general—the fires constituting its overt acts, were neither executed by the hands, nor devised by the heads, of the peasantry of the county of Kent—no suspicion attached to the resident population—the whole of the matter, whatever might be its origin, was devised by other heads than theirs, and proceeded upon principles, not local, but general. Though, up to the present moment, no detection had taken place; but he did hope that the time was near when not only the hands by which the offences were committed, but, what was more important, the heads by which they were devised, would be brought to condign punishment.

Sir *Edward Knatchbull* bore testimony to the fact, that Government had given immediate assistance on being applied to, and he had much satisfaction in being able to state, that in the eastern part of the county the efforts for the suppression of disturbance had not been altogether unsuccessful; and in the eastern part of the county he had the means of knowing that many of the inhabitants had used great exertion to discover the causes of the disturbance, and to put an end to it. Similar exertions had also been used in other parts of the county, for the same purpose; but the continuance of those exertions was more than could be expected from individuals if public measures were not resorted to for the restoration of peace and tranquillity. From every inquiry that he was enabled to make, he could declare, that the conflagrations in the county of Kent were not caused by the peasantry of the land. He was persuaded that the peasantry were actuated by a very different feeling from that which influenced the authors of those outrages; the peasantry were, he was assured, full of attachment to their employers, and the least likely men in the world to commit acts of that diabolical character. Another consideration led him to acquit the peasantry of the county of Kent; they were not so ignorant as not to be aware that those burnings would prove most injurious to their own interest—even destroying the very means of their own subsistence.

Mr. *Briscoe* thought it was due to join with the hon. member for Kent in saying that the Government had done all that could be expected of it to ascertain the authors of these fires, and put an end to them. He regretted that the spirit which prevailed in the county of Kent had spread itself to two parishes in the county which he had the honour to represent, but he entertained not the least doubt that the labouring poor of the district were perfectly innocent of those offences.

Petition to be printed.

RECOVERY OF SMALL DEBTS.] Mr. *Sykes* asked the right hon. Secretary when he meant to introduce a Bill for facilitating the recovery of small debts.

Sir *R. Peel* begged to remind the hon. Member that, in the last Session, after he had given notice of that measure, the hon. and learned member for Yorkshire (Mr. Brougham) obtained leave to bring in a bill to extend the powers of local courts, and to give to them a more beneficial jurisdiction. As the bill of the hon. and learned Member would include all that it was intended to effect by the measure referred to, he had waited until the sense of the House should be taken upon it.

AMENDMENT OF THE STATUTE OF FRAUDS.] The *Solicitor General* moved for leave to bring in a bill to restore and amend the Act of the 29th Charles 2nd c, 3. known by the name of the Statute of Frauds. At a very early period of the reign of Charles 2nd this Statute was passed, for the purpose of preventing the inconvenience which arose from men being considered as bound by word of mouth, without the bargains to which they agreed having been put into writing and signed by the parties. He wished first to make a few observations on that portion of the Act which referred to contracts for land. The Statute enacts that no one shall bring an action against another party unless the agreement by which such action shall be brought, or some memorandum or note thereof, shall be in writing, and duly signed. The Amendment which he meant to propose by the Bill he wished to bring in, would be of the utmost importance to every man in the country, as it would apply to all contracts, whether for the sale and purchase of land, or for the sale and purchase of goods. The Statute enacts, as regards land, "that no person can bring an action against another unless the agreement by which such action be brought, or some memorandum or note thereof, shall be in writing, and signed by the party to be charged therewith, or some other party thereunto, by him lawfully authorised." To amend this Act was of the utmost importance, inasmuch as it related, in a greater or less degree, to the transactions of every man. That part of the law which related to the sale of lands required an agreement in writing, signed by the party to be charged: whereas the contract for the sale of goods required the signature of both parties. It had long been considered, and he had no doubt was so intended, that the signature to an agreement for the sale of lands ought to be plural. The present mode had afforded an opportunity, in many instances, for the exercise of fraud. If he were to write an order for any person to sell his estate, that person could do so, and he should be bound by that act: for the other party, to compel him to perform the contract would only have to file a bill in Chancery. Many transactions of this nature had taken place, and the property of the party been completely wasted by the expenses. Even upon a mere letter had such a course been adopted. In regard to the sale of an estate by auction, the auctioneer did not sign the agreement, although he compelled the owner and seller to attach his signature to the instrument, and he then had his remedy against the seller in case of his not completing the contract. This was one of the unequal results of the Act he was desirous of amending. The Statute had led to the greatest inconvenience, and caused enormous expense. He purposed to remedy these evils by making all the parties sign the agreement, so that all might become bound by it, by which the establishment of a better understanding and of greater equality would ensue. That would prevent he believed not mere inconvenience, but much litigation. It would also have the effect of compelling the parties to come to a proper understanding before putting their names to an agreement and it would put an end to acting on one of a series of letters alone, which, in some cases, had been held as forming a contract. To shew some of the effects of the law as it at present stood, he would quote a case and an opinion of the late Lord Thurlow on the effect of this Act. One party had agreed to sell a certain property, and another had consented to become the purchaser. An agreement of contract was prepared for the signature of the two parties; and it happened that, at the time appointed for its execution, the seller could not attend. A note was, therefore, written, and sent off to him, appointing another meeting; but to that also he was unable to come. He, however, sent a letter, in which he stated that he considered his word to be as sacred as any oath Accordingly, the purchaser executed the agreement, considering that it was as good as executed by the seller, but he was mistaken. The seller refused to act upon the agreement, and the purchaser was compelled to file a bill in Chancery. On the matter coming on for Lord Thurlow's decision, his Lordship held, that under the Statute of Frauds, the agreement was good, and the purchaser was entitled to the property. Another part of the Bill: related to the signing and attestation of wills. The Statute of Frauds requires "that the will shall be signed by the testator, and that such signature shall be witnessed by three or four credible witnesses, who shall affix their names to the will, as an attestation of that fact, in the presence of the testator." The object of this part of the Statute of Frauds was, to secure that the witnesses should be present at the time the testator signed his will, and that the testator should see them affix their names to the document, as witnesses of his last act and deed. It was, however, soon discovered that cases frequently occurred where this was not done. He remembered a case where a lady went in her carriage to the chambers of her legal adviser in Lincoln's Inn, for the purpose of executing her will. The clerk went to her, but she refused to alight, and executed the will in the carriage, which had been backed in such a manner as to enable the clerks in the office to see her put her signature. After that was done, the will was taken into the office, and the clerks signed it as having witnessed the act. That was held to be a good attestation. At this moment there was a case somewhat of a similar nature in the Court of Chancery, where it had been for many years, and of course attended with great expense; the case of the Duke of Roxburgh. The testator was in so debilitated a state, as to make it dangerous for him to have strangers in his room. It was therefore arranged, that the door which communicated with the room adjoining that in which the invalid was confined, should be thrown open, and that a table should be drawn in a line with his Grace's head, so as to enable him to witness the signatures of the witnesses to his own signature. The witnesses having been placed in such a situation as to obtain a view of his Grace, the will was taken to him when he was in a state of extreme exhaustion; and after he had signed it, it was carried into the other room, where it was attested by the individuals who attended for that purpose. Nothing could have been fairer. The will, however, had been disputed; and the question raised was, whether the witnesses signed at that part of the table which was in the line with the head of the testator; or whether they affixed their signatures when they were standing on that side of the table which was not in the line. The question had already been decided by two juries; but the Judge not being satisfied, according to the law of the Statute of Frauds, had sent it for trial again. He found no fault with the learned Judge, because he was bound by his oath to be satisfied as to the law, and to take care that the decision was according to the meaning of the particular Statute under which the case might come. It was, however, disgraceful to the law of this country that t should lead to such results—the Judge being compelled either to direct against his oath, or to find against the law. That was a state of things which ought not to continue longer than could possibly be avoided, and he meant to propose by the bill which he moved for leave to bring in, that it shall be enacted, that all witnesses to the signature of a testator do, *bonâ fide*, attest the same before they depart from the house, and that attestations of this nature shall be considered as valid. Having given a slight sketch of the bill, and some of the leading points in it, he should move for leave to bring in a bill to amend and extend the provisions of the 29th Charles 2nd c. 3, entitled an Act for the Prevention of Frauds.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* said, nothing could be more delightful he was sure, to the House, or give more satisfaction to the country, than to find the officers of the Crown ready to bring forward propositions for the reform of the laws. An effect might be produced in the various Courts by declamations and orations; but it was only by introducing judicious reform, that a beneficial result could be produced; and it was to be regretted that the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite should be able to bestow only a small portion of his time on the important subject of legal reform. Were it otherwise, the work of improvement would not move on so slowly. On those parts of the generality of Acts which related to matters of law, manifold constructions were continually put. If, therefore, in every Session but one wholesome measure was introduced, we could not expect that reform in the Court of Equity which was so much required, to be completed before many years. He was sure that the opinion expressed by the hon. and learned Gentleman on the doubtful constructions of the law, must have weight; and he hoped that he would devise some plan by which all unnecessary inquiries into the title to estates should be put a stop to. Some law was required to set those inquiries at rest, which under the present laws, were continually arising. It would be advisable that some system should be laid down by which the possessor of an estate should be undisturbed in his possession. He should say, for instance, that if evidence could be given of possession for the period of twenty years, it would perhaps, be the best security to such property that could be devised.

Mr. *O'Connell* was of opinion, that the

the Bill proposed by the hon. and learned Gentleman was a measure of great importance. He should not trespass on the time of the House, were it not to express his regret at the mischief arising from the Judges making the law, instead of having it made for them by the Legislature. It was with great satisfaction that he had that evening witnessed an attempt to improve the Statute of Frauds; in proof of the necessity of an alteration, he adverted to the fact, that though the Statute of Frauds was passed late in the seventeenth century, yet, before the end of that century, the litigation arising out of it cost the people of this country not less than a million of money. It was a disgrace to England that she did not possess a code—she should have her laws in a small book accessible to every one. The merit of a code was always admitted by the nations that had enjoyed one, and the longer it had been known in any nation the more that nation was attached to it. The Bourbons, it was well known, could not have been restored, had they not consented to retain the code Napoleon and it was one of the chief grievances of the Belgians that that code had been abolished in their country. That code was by no means perfect, but the simplicity and brevity which distinguished it were its great recommendations. The evils of our laws were manifest, and the habit which had grown up in this country for the Judges to make the law by the interpretations they put on the Statutes was most mischievous. The Statute of Frauds was not understood for 150 years—till Lord Ellenborough in the case of Warne *v.* Warlters, discovered the true construction. In making that discovery the noble Lord upset all the previous decisions on the subject, and the unhappy clients who might have acted under the advice of their lawyers, founded upon previous decisions, would have found themselves in the wrong. It was true that Lord Eldon had never bowed to Lord Ellenborough's decision in Warne *v.* Warlters; but it was admitted at the present day as a binding authority. Under these circumstances he recommended a code. Every contingency must, in some measure, be provided for, and the only question was, whether it should be provided for at first or at last? He declared that he had never felt a comfortable hour in the discharge of the duties of his profession, for he was always sure, under our present system of laws, that justice was only to be got by accident.

Mr. *Hughes Hughes* supported the Motion and offered to the hon. and learned Solicitor General his humble praise for his great and continued exertion in bringing forward so many useful measures.

Mr. *Campbell* said, that the hon. and learned Solicitor General would add to his high character by the measure which he now proposed. The first part of that measure related to the sale of lands under the Statute of Frauds. To that he had no objection, but he much wished, that the hon. and learned Gentleman would allow the subject of wills to remain untouched, for that was at present under the consideration of the commission of which he had the honour to be a Member. The law relating to wills was certainly in a most unsettled and barbarous state. Three witnesses were now required to authenticate a will, which was to pass a quarter of an acre of land, if it happened to be freehold; while property to the amount of 20,000*l.* a year might be disposed of, even without any signature, if that property happened to be copyhold; and the same was the case with regard to property of any amount in the funds. That, however, was not all. A change of the tenure by which the land was held would defeat a will. There was the case of the late Lord Erskine, in whose favour a will had been made, but who lost it because the gentleman who intended to leave it him had, after making the will, suffered a recovery, in order, as he supposed, to make all sure in favour of his legatee. The act of suffering a recovery was, by the operation of law, a revocation of the will, and though the testator had intended just the contrary, Lord Erskine lost the estate. Another evil consisted of the rules of interpretation in cases of wills. If a man left another a horse, the legatee received the property in full and absolute possession, but if he left "a field called Blackacre," to any person, the legatee would only have an estate for life because the testator did not add the words, "his heirs and assigns for ever." As to the point of adverse possession, he agreed with the hon. Member for Colchester, that twenty years of adverse possession ought to give a title, and such was now proposed to be the rule. This subject had been under the consideration of the commissioner and that was the decision they had come to. He feared that the law never could be made as perfect as the hon. member for Waterford imagined. Every man could not be his own lawyer. Law was a science, and must be acquired, and men could no more be their own lawyers than their own physicians. He feared, too, even if a code were introduced, that Judge-made law could not be avoided. There was as much Judge-made law in France as in England; the reports of cases in France were more numerous than our own reports; for wherever there was law there would arise cases not exactly foreseen, and then the Judges must become the interpreters of the law, and to that extent the law-makers. What he admired the code Napoleon most for was that it gave one law to the whole country, instead of the different systems which formerly prevailed in its different provinces.

Mr. *Hume* was happy to hear so many reformers on every side of the House; and since the hon. and learned Gentleman had thus frankly stated his opinion on the subject of adverse possessions, perhaps it might be allowable to ask him whether the proposal as to twenty years adverse possession giving title was to be applicable to church property? He asked the question because he thought the time was come when church property ought to be put on the same footing as other property?

Mr. *Campbell* thought that, in cases of church property, this rule ought to be applicable so far as possible. That at least was his private opinion. He had devoted a great part of the late vacation to framing such a law. That law must be framed differently from laws relating to other property, for church property was held upon so many and such various tenures. It was his wish that the church should preserve all its present possessions, but that the litigations now daily arising with respect to the tithes should be at an end. That would be beneficial to the church, and, as a friend of the church, he should recommend it.

The *Solicitor General* regretted, that the question as to Church property had been put to his hon. and learned friend, as that matter was not yet in a state to be presented to the public. As to the other questions now under the consideration of the House, there was but one opinion; but the question was as to the time at which the limitation was to take effect? He was opposed to a code. We had, at present, the finest body of laws in the world, and it was not necessary for the hon. member for Middlesex to understand them as well as a lawyer. Law was, and must be, a science, and it would be the greatest possible curse when it was not so, and when every man could understand it, for at that instant certainty would have flown. If to-morrow the plainest law possible were to be made, in time the interpretation of that law would become matter of science. He maintained that in no country in the world were there, as in England, so many means of limitation, with regard to an estate, so as to secure a life enjoyment to the owner, and a provision for his family after his death. All that could not be accomplished by the simple declaration "it shall be so." The most fixed words were required for such a purpose; [*hear, hear!*] and it was for hon. Members who cried hear, hear! to learn these words. He repeated, that if the law was to be reduced to a code, certainty in it would be gone, and "certainty," as the law said, "was the mother of repose." The law had a peculiar language, which it required time to understand; and when he said it was not necessary for the hon. member for Middlesex to understand it, he meant that the man who devoted his attention to other subjects must not expect to be able to understand the law. He did not pretend to rival that hon. Member in a knowledge of finance, and that hon. Member could hardly expect to be equal in his knowledge of the law to those who had studied it all their lives. He trusted that the measure he was about to introduce would satisfy the best wishes of the country.

Leave given.

OFFICERS OF THE ARMY.] Mr. *Hume* complained that the Officers of the Army were too numerous. It might be supposed that the numbers of the officers were limited by the numbers of the Army. It was no such thing. Two or three years ago the Commander-in-chief had made a supernumerary corps of officers, and the consequence of this would be, that our pension-list would shortly be much increased. He wished to know the number of unattached officers from December, 1828, to June, 1830, and he moved for a Return to that effect.

Sir *H. Hardinge* had no objection to the Return, and if the noble Lord connected with that department had anticipated any observations, he would have been there to have answered them. The unattached officers were taken from those on half-pay, and the manner in which that had been done would, he was sure, when it was explained, meet with the approbation of the public.

Returns ordered.

Mr. *Hume* then moved for Returns of Officers promoted since the Accession of his present Majesty, and for an account of the additional expense thus created. He knew that it had been the custom to make promotions on the accession of a new King, but the time had gone by when we could afford such an unnecessary increase of our expenditure.

Sir *H. Hardinge* said, that whenever the question fairly came before the House, it would be found that the promotions referred to did not much increase the expense. He did not object to the Return.

Mr. *Hume* also moved for Returns of the Half-pay of the regular Troops, and ot the Half-pay of the Militia. It had been said, that the half-pay was retained in this manner, as a security for the future services of the officers who retained it. That, however, was not the case; for when he, on a former occasion, moved for a Return of the Officers who were receiving half-pay, and who were acting as clergymen in the country, it was said there were none who were so acting; but some time afterwards it was discovered that about forty persons in holy orders were receiving half-pay.

The Returns ordered.

SUSSEX JURY BILL.] Mr. W. Burrell moved the second reading of the Sussex Jury Bill.

Mr. *Campbell* rose to oppose the Bill, and said, he should take the sense of the House upon it. If carried into effect it would produce a most important alteration in the Jury-law, as established by the bill of 1826. By that law the number of Special Jury was to be reduced by chance. The present Bill proposed to effect a division of the county of Sussex into the two districts of Horsham and Lewes; and create one list for one of these divisions, and another for the remaining one. He was opposed to such a division, and thought that the law ought to be uniform. It was said that this Bill was introduced on account of the inconvenient distance of the Assize town from different parts of the county. But the same objection, though existing more strongly with respect to common than to special jurymen, was not made in their favour. In Somersetshire, and in Surrey, the Assizes were held in three places; in Norfolk, in Berkshire, and in Buckinghamshire at two; and if the principle of this Bill was good, other Acts ought to be passed dividing those counties into as many districts as there were Assize towns in them. But he objected to the Bill on another principle; namely, that it would operate to the prejudice of plaintiffs in some cases. Suppose a poor man brought an action against a Magistrate, for illegally committing him to prison, was that action to be tried by a jury of brother Magistrates selected from the same districts with the defendant? Certainly not. Besides, as this Bill was now framed, the selection of the jury must depend on the district division of the county in which the Assizes were held. That town depended on the will of the Judge. In Sussex itself the Assizes were once held at East Grinstead; and suppose the Judges should choose to hold the Assizes at Brighton (which he thought would soon be found to be the most convenient) what would become of this Bill? He thought that in every way the Bill was objectionable, and he should therefore move that it be read a second time that day six months.

Mr. *Hughes Hughes* seconded the Amendment. The Bill by being limited to special juries, made, in fact, one law for the rich and another for the poor. Other counties needed as much such a bill as Sussex, and if the principle were good, the Bill ought to be extended to them, not confined to Sussex.

Mr. *W. Burrell* contended, that juries in the western division of the county would be just as impartial as juries from the county generally. If any suspicion arose, it was well known that in cases of special juries the parties to the action might strike off whom they pleased. As far as common juries were concerned, it was already customary to take them from the immediate neighbourhood of the Assize town.

Mr. *O'Connell* referred to one county of Ireland which was similarly circumstanced to Sussex, and expressed his hope that the principle of the Bill would be extended to the sister kingdom. He repelled the objection taken to narrow and local jurisdictions, and argued that it was highly beneficial that every poor man should have a law-shop near his home. In England neither party had an advantage over the other, as juries were drawn by lot.

Sir *J. Shelley* knew, that the people of Sussex frequently complained of the expense they were put to by going such a distance. The Bill he was convinced would tend to the convenience of the people, and he should support it.

Sir *Edward Knatchbull* thought the Bill was calculated to be of use to all parties. The hon. and learned Member who opposed the Bill was mistaken in his view, for experience had informed all Magistrates that jurors might be taken from a limited neighbourhood without the risk of injustice. He felt grateful to the member for Waterford for the disinterested support he had given to this English Bill, and he hoped when he brought forward any local measure for Ireland, that he would receive the same assistance from English Members.

Sir *C. Burrell* highly approved of the Bill, and thought its imperfections might be remedied in a committee.

Mr. *John Wood* thought the principle of the Bill so good that he would have it extended to other counties of England, requiring the same change; and he particularly instanced Lancashire, where the Assizes were held in a remote corner of the county, whither suitors, witnesses, and jurors were obliged ro repair. This circumstance of itself operated as a denial of justice to the poor.

Mr. *Curteis* knew from experience the inconvenience of the present state of things, for he had frequently had to travel fifty miles to attend an Assize. This Bill was desired by the county, and it was so simple that he did not conceive any objection could be made to it.

Lord *Morpeth* expressed his opinion that such a measure could be advantageously applied to Yorkshire.

Mr. *Sandford* wished such a Bill to be applied to Somersetshire.

Mr. Campbell withdrew his Amendment.

The Bill read a second time.

SLAVERY.] Lord *Norreys* presented a Petition from a Town in the county of Waterford, praying for the abolition of Slavery. The noble Lord observed, that he would take care in future to put his name on the Speaker's list, before that of the hon. member for Waterford (Mr. O'Connell) as for three nights he had been detained, for three hours, while that hon. Gentleman excited debate.

Mr. *Ruthven*, as an Irishman, protested against such personal attacks.

Mr. *Hume* also protested against such irregular references to the parliamentary conduct of any Member. If the noble Lord wanted to get away from the House early, he ought to have attended earlier. This night the debate had been produced by an attack on the honour and character of his hon. friend, who was driven into the discussion in mere self-defence.

The *Speaker* observed, that as the noble Lord was a young Member, he had not noticed the remark, which was certainly irregular. This House was not the place, where the attendance of Members should be made a matter of complaint, but he thought that the noble Lord had meant what he said merely in good humour.

The Petition having been brought up,

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that he courted the censure of those who could frivolously assail a Member for attendance in the discharge of his duty. He had no connection with Ministers and expected nothing from them; and if the noble Lord would consult only his conscience in his vote, and do as much for Ireland as he (Mr. O'Connell) had done, more fame would attend the noble Lord than had belonged to any of his ancestors that he had ever heard of.

The *Speaker* interposed. The hon. Gentleman had not the excuse of being a new Member; and it was highly irregular to urge imputations, more especially prospectively. A comparison of parliamentary conduct was neither fair nor regular.

Mr. *O'Connell* was convinced at once that he had been in error; and the personal nature of the attack of the noble Lord, which excited in him some indignation, was his only excuse.

Petition laid on the Table.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, Nov. 10.

MINUTES.] Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. M. A. TAYLOR, an Account of the number of Cases, Exceptions, further Directions, Pleas, and Demurrers, entered for argument before the Vice-Chancellor and Master of the Rolls, on the first day of each Michaelmas Term in 1827-28-29 and 30; and also the number of Cases, &c. remaining on each of those days before the same Judges.

Petitions presented. For the abolition of Slavery, principally from Protestant Dissenting Congregations, by Mr. DENMAN, from sixty-seven places in Nottinghamshire:—By Sir JAMES CARNEGIE, from Aberdeen:—By Sir G.

PONSONBY, two from Youghall:—By Mr. WRIGHTSON, from Hull:—By Mr. ORMSBY GORE, from Carnarvon:—By Mr. FOLEY, from Stourport:—By Lord F. OSBORNE, from Wisbeach:—By Mr. JAMES BROUGHAM, from Downton; and two other places in Wiltshire:—By Mr. C. W. WYNN, from Welsh Pool; and another place in Montgomeryshire:—By Mr. FORRESTER, from Broseley;—By Mr. BRISCOE, from Croydon, Guildford, Tunbridge Wells, Sheerness, and eleven other places in Surrey and Kent:—By Mr. ADEANE, from Wisbeach; and seven other places:—By Sir E. KNATCHBULL, from Margate:—By Mr. HODGES, two from Greenwich:—By Mr. W. WHITMORE, from Kidderminster:—By Sir J. MACKINTOSH, from the Protestant Dissenting Ministers in London, Westminster, and the neighbourhood:—By Sir G. ROBINSON, from Northampton:—By Mr. J. WOOD, from Preston and Salford:—By Mr. STEWART, nine from Bedfordshire:—By Admiral SOTHERON, three from Nottinghamshire:—By Mr. HUGHES HUGHES, from Oxford:—By Mr. BEAUMONT, four from the County of Northumberland:—By Mr. WILKS, from Shaftesbury, Stepney, and Ponder's End:—By Mr. SYKES, from a place in Yorkshire:—By Sir J. GRAHAM, eighteen from Cumberland, and eleven from Westmoreland:—By Mr. LABOUCHERE, from Taunton and Falwood:—By Lord BELGRAVE, from Macclesfield:—By Mr. LONG WELLESLEY, from Chelmsford:—By Mr. PENDARVIS, from ninety-six places in Cornwall (96 Petitions). Against the Annual Grant to the Society for the Education of the Poor (Ireland), by Mr. A. DAWSON, from Tuam.

ABSENCE OF THE MINISTERS.] Mr. Brougham (it being rather more than half-past-three) repeated the observations which he made the other evening on the impropriety of the House being left without any Minister during the presentation of Petitions on important subjects.

Sir *R. Peel*, who almost immediately afterwards entered the House, expressed his surprise at the observations which the hon. and learned Gentleman had made in his absence. He had never understood that in consequence of the new arrangement it was imperative upon Ministers to be in the House at three o'clock. He tried to reconcile his various duties as well as he could, but it was impossible for a Secretary of State to be always able to leave his office at a particular moment. He should have thought that the state of the town last night might have led the hon. and learned Gentleman to infer that he had not been altogether unoccupied that morning. He had also been attending his Majesty at the levee, and had received his Majesty's gracious permission to leave the Court before the termination of the levee (contrary to the usage), in order that he might be enabled to attend his duty in that House.

Mr. *Brougham* could not tell why the right hon. Gentleman was so angry at what had fallen from him. He was not the only Minister. It was the Clerk of the Ordnance who had been more particularly wanted in the House that evening. The right hon. Gentleman complained, that in his absence he (Mr. Brougham) had complained of his not being present. He did not well see how he could have complained that the right hon. Gentleman was absent if he had been present. His understanding of the late arrangement might be wrong; but he certainly understood that a Minister was to be present, at least by half-past-three. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the state of the town last night might have led him to infer that he (Sir R. Peel) had not been altogether unoccupied that morning. What the right hon. Gentleman meant by the state of the town last night he was at a loss to conjecture. He had yesterday evening walked down the Strand, and passed the Horse-guards and the Admiralty; and had certainly seen a great crowd: but a more innocent, a more peaceable, a more harmless, a more good-humoured assemblage, he had never witnessed. There was certainly an immense body of police drawn up in four companies, in military array. But as to the crowd, he had never seen a less disposition to tumult or riot. Men, women, and children—and especially many well-dressed women—were gathered together, and gazing on the manner in which the houses were decorated with laurel-leaves, and crowns, and the initials of their most gracious Majesties, and on the manœuvres of the police. He saw nothing whatever which could lead to any apprehension of a violation of the peace.

Sir *R. Peel* observed, that the hon. and learned Gentleman was, he fancied, almost the only person who had viewed the scene of last night in that light. For himself he knew that there had been some severe collisions between the police and the mob; and that a great part of his morning had been employed on that subject.

Mr. *Beaumont* said, that there certainly had been some serious disturbances and breaches of the peace in the neighbourhood of Temple-bar. He was afraid that as long as the present Administration remained in power, the mornings of the right hon. Gentleman would be but too frequently occupied as they had been that day.

DR. PHILLPOTTS.] Sir *James Graham* stated, that a Petition had been presented some time ago to his Majesty, from the Parishioners of the Parish of Stanhope, in the County of Durham, respecting the intended elevation of Dr. Phillpotts, the Rector of that parish, to the vacant See of Exeter. He now gave notice, that on Thursday se'nnight he would move for the production of that petition.

Mr. *Beaumont* observed, that great discontent had been excited in the parish of Stanhope, containing 12,000 persons, by the apprehension that Dr. Phillpotts was to be allowed to retain the possession of the rectory of that parish, the tithes of which amounted to 4,000*l.* a year. He wished the right hon. Gentleman opposite would state what were the intentions of his Majesty's Government on the subject.

Sir *R. Peel* answered, that the rectory had formerly been held by a Bishop, and it was to be held by the Bishop of Exeter *in commendam*.

Sir *James Graham* said, that in consequence of what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman he would change the nature of his intended Motion, adopt at once a more direct course, and move an Address to his Majesty on the subject.

TAXATION AND REFORM.] Mr. *Hume* presented a Petition from the inhabitants of Mary-le-bone, agreed to at a public meeting, where 3,000 persons were assembled complaining of Distress. He begged leave to call the attention of the House to the petition, which spoke the sense of the majority of the inhabitants of that parish, and he believed of the people of this kingdom. The petitioners say:—

> "That this country, unparalleled in the annals of history, has been brought to a state utterly at variance with its knowledge, industry, wealth, and enterprise; that this state is the consequence of a bad administration in its affairs; that this bad administration is the inevitable consequence of the popular branch of the Government not having been elected by the people, nor accountable to the people."

On this point he agreed with the petitioners, who went on to say—

> "That the Members of your hon. House are returned by a very small minority of the male population of this kingdom who are householders; that the means by which a majority of the Members of your hon. House are returned, are—by the undue influence of Peers; by the undue influence of a few wealthy persons not Peers; by the undue influence of the Treasury; by the influence of terror, as it is in various ways exercised over electors; by the purchase of seats for rotten boroughs; by persons who are returned for their own boroughs; by bribery and corruption, now again all but openly practised, and other modes and practices, all calculated to make your hon. House dependent on the aristocratical branch of the Government, instead of being, as it ought to be, dependent on the people, and on the people only."

No relief, he was persuaded, could be effected without a change in this system—without, in other words, putting down the monopoly in the manufacture of Members of Parliament. It was the monopoly of a set of men, who used every exertion to put into their own pockets as much as they could of the public taxes. That was his opinion; and he was happy to find, that the people, who were of the same opinion, were now beginning to come forward, and express their sentiments upon the subject. The country was in a state of the greatest wretchedness, and the squalid appearance which a large portion of its inhabitants presented, was such as to excite feelings of compassion for them, but disgust for the persons to whom they owed their misery. Such a state of things ought not to be allowed. The petitioners said, that undue influence was still kept up in different parts of the kingdom by bribery and corruption, which no measure was so likely to prevent as voting by ballot. That formed in his opinion one of the most important subjects of Reform. The petitioners also stated—

> "That the taxes levied on the people are so large in amount as to exceed the sum of one million of pounds sterling for every six working days in each week."

The people of this country were taxed in a degree never equalled in the history of the world. He was sorry to hear the right hon. Baronet opposite state a few evenings ago, that the Government was not prepared to say whether there would be any reduction of taxation. The Ministers would not make up their minds on meeting the new Parliament, to make reductions and retrenchments, because they were determined to wait and ascertain the temper of this Parliament. But although they could not say anything on this subject, they were ready enough to state that they were determined to oppose every measure of Reform, from whatever quarter it might emanate. He understood that it was stated by a noble Duke in another place, that as long as he had any control in the Government, Reform should never be conceded. If such were the case

—if it were the fixed determination of Government to oppose with all its power, the important Question of Reform, all that he would say, was, God send that their time may be short. He was satisfied that this declaration had already greatly increased the dissatisfaction of the people, and unless something was speedily done, that dissatisfaction would increase to an alarming extent. He was afraid this spirit of discontent would so increase as to affect the security of property, and to occasion alarm in the heart of every person having property to lose. He could not help expressing his apprehension at the declaration, that, notwithstanding the strength of public opinion in favour of Reform, and however it might be expressed, Ministers were determined not to listen to it. If the petitions of the people in favour of Reform were not attended to, how could they be satisfied? What measures would Ministers adopt to prevent them from looking to some other resource? As for the taxes, it was impossible for the people to bear them. The petitioners said,—

> "That so numerous are these taxes, that an adequate description of them and their operation would fill a volume.
>
> "That these taxes, so enormous in the aggregate, are unequal and partial, favouring the rich, and unjustly oppressing all the rest of the community.
>
> "That not only are the taxes oppressive which the people are compelled to pay, but the misgovernment they have engendered is even more inimical to the welfare of the nation, as they have induced Ministers to abridge the liberties of the subject; to maintain an immense standing army in time of peace, an army greater than ever existed during any war preceding the last; to proceed in divers ways to preserve their influence; to depress trade; to injure manufactures; to impede commerce; to embarrass agriculture, and to do great evil to all the useful portion of the community.
>
> "That these oppressive, unequal, and enormous taxes have engendered very general discontent, which is every day increasing, and may lead to consequences, the bare contemplation of which is calculated to make every reflecting man shudder.
>
> "That this lamentable state of a nation, so ingenious, skilful, intelligent, and industrious, would never have been brought about by a House of Commons fairly chosen by the people.
>
> "That it is a state equally disgraceful to the nation and to the Government, in the opinion of all thinking men, both natives and foreigners.
>
> "That these evils, enormous as they are, might and would with ease be remedied by a House of Commons elected by a majority of the householders; in such a House the people would place implicit confidence, support its measures, promote its views, and in conjunction with the other branches of the Legislature, speedily work out the salvation of the country."

This was the result of a most monstrous and abominable system. Even this evening the right hon. Baronet opposite, with all the coolness imaginable, admitted that it was intended to allow a reverend gentleman, about to be made a Bishop, to retain the spiritual charge of a parish containing 12,000 persons, the tithes of which amount to 4,000*l.* a-year. Was it proper, was it consistent, that a Bishop, residing nearly 400 miles distant from this parish, should be allowed to hold the living? He was happy that the hon. Baronet, the member for Cumberland, had given notice of a motion for an Address to the Crown upon the subject, and he trusted that it would be sufficient to induce Ministers to make Dr. Phillpotts resign this living. If Parliament were reformed such things would not be allowed in the Church, nor would a Minister get up and defend them. After the declaration made by the Ministers on the subject of reform, and after their refusal to state whether they intended to make any reduction in taxation, the House ought to bring them to a proper sense of their duty, or compel them to resign the helm of government to those who would attend to the wishes and feelings of the people: they might learn something of the sentiments of the people by this passage of the petition. The petitioners said, that they were

> "Resolved to do their duty to themselves and to their fellow-citizens as long as any hope remains. They beg to call the attention of your hon. House to means which may be used to enable your hon. House to abolish a large amount of taxes. These means are—the abolition of all sinecure places of every kind, and by whomsoever held; the abolition of all pensions where no services have been performed; the reduction of all pensions to a sum commensurate with real service; abolition of all useless places; reduction of salaries of all overpaid useful places to the lowest sum for which needful services can be adequately performed; reduction of the standing army; reduction in the Ordnance department; abandonment of every colonial establishment for which the colony is unable or unwilling to pay; the most economical arrangement with such colonies as are able and willing to defray all

> the expenses they may incur; application in aid of taxes of the revenue under the management of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests; economy and saving in every department, and in every office; strict accountability of every person in every public employment."

The people, the hon. Member continued' had no longer the means of paying for these enormous establishments. The profits in trade had materially diminished within the last few years; yet a man was called upon to pay the same amount of taxes now, as when his profits were three times as great. Taxes were now three times more burthensome owing to the change in the value of money than they were twenty years ago. The petitioners urged very strongly the importance and necessity of reducing taxation: if, however, to do that were left to the Ministers, he was convinced that no reduction would be made. Indeed, a declaration had gone forth, not only against reduction, but even against an inquiry as to whether reductions could with propriety be effected. The petitioners concluded by stating,

> "We beg to direct your prompt and serious attention to those of vital importance—the assessed house and window taxes, which your petitioners feel, beyond the general pressure of taxation, in consequence of the inequality with which they are laid, rendering them unjust in their operation: they further expose your petitioners too frequently to the vindictive feelings of the collectors, and prove a formidable barrier to improvement. We therefore pray your hon. House to take such measures as may enable you to repeal the same, and thus grant immediate relief to your petitioners."

The petitioners prayed for reduction of taxation to such an amount as to give relief to the whole people, and it was his firm opinion, that retrenchments might be made in our various establishments to such an extent as to give relief to the amount of seven millions a-year. This would enable the House to take off the coal-tax, the assessed taxes, the taxes on candles and paper, and, indeed, on all articles which were at present under the control of the Excise. To all these taxes he objected most strongly, not so much on account of the money they levied as the restrictions they imposed on industry; restrictions which checked enterprise, and were utterly and completely at variance with that spirit of free-trade which the Ministers had pretended to adopt in our commerce with other countries. But our domestic industry was of more importance than our foreign trade; and a wise government would consider, that its highest duty was, to encourage domestic industry. The abolition of these taxes would immediately revive trade, and give renewed activity to every branch of manufacture, of commerce, and agriculture, as well as allay the growing discontent of the people. Why, too, he would ask, might not the corn-laws be repealed, which operated as a tax to the amount of ten millions a-year, without being of the least benefit to any class of the community? It was his intention to bring that subject under the attention of the House at a very early period, when he hoped that he should be able to shew the impolicy of these laws. He was convinced that they were beneficial neither to the farmer nor the landlord, and that, so far from putting money into the pockets of the agriculturist, they were prejudicial to his interests, by increasing the amount of poor-rates and tithes. When the subject was brought regularly before the House, he would prove that relief could be safely given to the amount of between seven or eight millions a-year, by deductions and retrenchments, and that also a further expense to the country might be saved, of ten or twelve millions a-year, by repealing the corn-laws, which were of no benefit to any class of the community; and also that those taxes, which at present pressed so heavily upon the productive industry, might be transferred to property. By adopting this system, he had no doubt that a saving to the amount of nearly twenty-one millions a-year might be made. If the corn-laws were repealed, those fluctuations would be prevented in the price of agricultural produce, which at present operated most prejudicially to the interest of the consumer. He was satisfied, that by the repeal the situation of the farmer and the agricultural labourer would be materially improved, and great relief would be afforded to all the other classes in the country. He feared, however, that the measures which he recommended would not be adopted unless reform took place, and it was to reform alone that the people must look for an efficient reduction of taxation, and efficient relief.

The Petition to be printed.

COLONIAL SLAVERY.] Mr. *Brougham* presented, in the mass, 355 Petitions, praying for the Abolition of Colonial Slavery. Of these, 283 were from places in Yorkshire, and sixty-five from places in Suffolk and Sussex. He declined wasting the time of the House by having them read, and abstained from saying anything respecting their subject-matter, until he should bring forward the motion of which he had given notice. If, by great calamity, his motion should be unsuccessful, he was convinced there would soon be twenty petitions for every one now before the House; and he also expressed his perfect confidence, that if his motion touching Reform in Parliament were not also carried, the petitions in support of its object would, in value, weight, and number, far exceed even those against Colonial Slavery.

LOCAL JURISDICTION BILL.] Mr. *Brougham*, in moving for leave to bring in this Bill, said, that having last Session so fully explained its nature, object, and provisions, he did not feel he should now be wanting in due respect to the House, or liable to the charge of indifference to the great cause of legal reform, if he abstained from entering on the subject generally, and avoided touching upon principles, reasons, and details. Last Session the Bill was allowed to be brought in, read a first and second time, and committed, upon the understanding that it was to proceed no further that year. Now, he wanted to be admitted to bring it through the same stages in such a manner that it might be carried in a reasonable time, and at such a period of the Session, that it would not be impossible for it to receive the sanction of the other House before the breaking up of Parliament. There were so many matters of a nature more urgent, and of at least equal importance, before the House, that he should not press for the second reading and committal of the Bill before Christmas. He should, however, expect that after that period there would be no delay.

ATTORNEYS — BREACH OF PRIVILEGE.] Mr. *Brougham* said, that before he sat down, he felt compelled to advert to another topic, which was, however, connected with the measure before the House. He believed there was not a single day during the Session, or during the Recess, or during the long vacation since February 1810—when he first entered that House—in which a breach of privilege had not been committed towards the person of the individual who then addressed them. Never, however, was he induced to complain except once—and that rather to oblige a noble person, then in the other House, than from any feeling of his own. An exceedingly offensive expression had been falsely attributed to this individual by the editor of a newspaper, contrary to the report in another part of his paper, and the noble Lord was anxious he (Mr. Brougham) should give him the opportunity of contradicting it, otherwise he would have suffered even that to pass unnoticed; but when there was an attempt made, by threatening letters, to deter a Member of Parliament from doing his duty, he considered himself bound to protest against it. He trusted that it would not be necessary for him to allude to the subject again; but that what he had now to say would operate as a lesson and a warning. He believed the persons who had evinced hostility to him were led on by a false feeling of Corporation-honour, and it was as well to advise them at once not "to lay the flattering unction to their souls" that he would be prevented by a combination of all the attorneys in Christendom, or any apprehensions of loss of practice, from endeavouring to make justice pure and cheap. These gentlemen, when they attacked him, were much mistaken if they thought he would die without defending himself. If the struggle arose, the question would be, whether barristers or attorneys should prevail; and he saw no reason why barristers should not open their doors to clients without the intervention of attorneys and their long bills of costs. He would not be the first to do this; but if he discovered that there was a combination against him, he decidedly would throw himself upon his clients—upon the country gentlemen, the merchants and manufacturers—and if he did not, with the help of that House, beat those leagued against him, he should be more surprised at it than at any misadventure of his life. Several respectable professional gentlemen had called upon him to tell him the meaning of the letter which he held in his hand, but that was unnecessary, for the meaning of it was evident enough. It was supposed, he understood, that he had denied the respectability of solicitors;

but this supposition was altogether erroneous; he had done no such thing: he had merely said, that there were malpractices among some solicitors, and in the same sentence in which he had said that, he had said also that there were malpractices among some barristers; but he did not mean, nor could any one, he thought, who had heard him, suppose he did mean, to deny the respectability of either branch of the profession. If this error were removed, there would remain no other ground for combination against him, except that he was endeavouring to make law cheap; and solicitors were very much mistaken if they supposed that it was against their interest to enable men to get law cheap. The word "presume" in his bill, which he understood gave much offence, was to be found as the term used in the old Acts of Parliament. In saying, therefore, "if any attorney should presume," he meant no offence, and would have no objection to change it. He felt that the fact of the attorneys being against it would be a great help to his measure. As for any combination against himself, he cared not for it, but he trusted what he now said would be sufficient. He had received a letter which was not to be misunderstood by a lawyer, though the words were rather vague [*Several Members called* "*read, read.*"] He said he had rather not read it, because it was signed by an individual whose name he did not think it necessary to mention. Suffice it to say, that he was told the attorneys would take every occasion in their power of *marking their sense* (these words were underlined) of such conduct. The letter, he understood, was a circular.

Sir *Robert Peel* agreed to the Bill's passing through the same stages as last Session, reserving to himself the right of opposing any part of it he thought exceptionable at a future period. He cordially approved of the Bill so far as it related to the facilitating the recovery of small debts; and if, on account of objections to other parts of the Bill, it was ultimately rejected, he would be happy to originate or support a measure which should have in view the object of which he so highly approved.

Mr. *Campbell* also approved of the facilitating the recovery of small debts; but he thought the Bill went too far. He would not then, however, state his objections. With respect to the threats held out against the hon. and learned Gentleman, with his profound and varied learning, and his brilliant eloquence, he might defy any combination.

Mr. *Tennant* declared he would oppose the Bill. He would not then enter into details, he would only say, that the Bill would make a very great alteration in our Courts, and in the whole administration of justice, and would, he believed, add very much to the expenses of the country.

Mr. *Tennyson* approved of the Bill, but wished that the House should come to an early decision, as the plan for the recovery of small debts, involved in it, was of great importance.

Mr. *O'Connell* was the friend of cheap justice. He wished Mr. Brougham had turned his powerful mind to the general system, and made a thorough reform, carrying cheap justice home to every man's door. He would also repeat his wish that there was a code, for without that there would be no certainty in the law.

Mr. *Brougham* disclaimed any intention of pulling down the judicial establishments of the country. On the contrary, he wished much of them to be preserved; and all he desired was, to reform those abuses which, whether introduced by the change of circumstances, or by defects in the original formation of these establishments, were now found united with them. He contended that his plan was not expensive, except at first starting, but that after it had been once established, the fees would more than pay the expenses. The small Courts in Scotland showed the correctness of this assertion. Now he was upon this subject, he wished to make one observation on an Essay published concerning him and his plans, written in a dialect of our language, which left no man at liberty to mistake the author—a most esteemed and valued and venerable friend of his—and in which he was accused, in direct and unmeasured terms—in terms of vituperation and abuse, that he certainly never expected from such an excellent and venerable person, and that went to charge him with being not only a mock reformer of the laws, but an opponent of all reforms—a person influenced by corrupt motives, and a dangerous enemy to the good of the State. The proof of such a charge was this, and a most curious proof it was:—that although the reforms he proposed might effect a present reduction of the expenses of litigation, yet that, in a few years, the amount of litigation would be so much increased, that the profits of the lawyers would be proportionably augmented. Now with respect to that argument, he would merely say, that whereas in the Circuit which he had now the honour to attend, there had been at the last assizes ninety-seven causes in a particular county, eighty-six of which would certainly have been cut off by his plan; he was so little influenced by corrupt motives, that he wished his plan to be adopted, though it would thus cut off eight-ninths of his business. The other party, however, admitted that consequence to be true, but said, that he expected a still greater increase at the expiration of a few years. He would only answer this by observing, that lawyers were not generally (especially those lawyers who, like him, were approaching the close of their career) men who, with the simplicity of the dog in the fable, in order to grasp at a shadow that seemed larger, quitted their hold of the substance they possessed. He made these remarks not in anger (for he esteemed and valued the author of the Essay too much, and held the charge itself too lightly to be angry), but with a view to show how little foundation there was for it. He did not think that any answer whatever had been made to the plan he proposed.

Mr. *Bruce* said, that three new Judges were about to be appointed, but if the plan of his hon. and learned friend were adopted, a great part of the business of the Courts would apparently be taken away, and then, he wished to know, where would be the necessity for their appointment?

Mr. *Brougham* answered, that two or three years at least must intervene before the change he proposed could produce all the effects he wished; and when it did, the only thing necessary was, for the Ministers to leave the vacancies on the Bench unfilled. He wished to take this opportunity of asking the right hon. Secretary for the Home Department why one appointment had been made in the Exchequer, at the expense of depriving the Court of King's Bench of a most amiable and excellent man, and a most learned and admirable Judge?

Sir *Robert Peel* said, that a part of the plan of the law reforms, was to equalize the fees of the Courts, and thus, as far as possible, to equalize the business of the Exchequer with that of the other Courts.

Mr. *Brougham* replied, that the equalization of fees never would produce such an effect. Under present circumstances, to which he need do no more than barely allude, business would not be driven into the Exchequer.

Motion agreed to, and Bill brought in.

CIVIL LIST—PRIVY COUNCIL.] The Chancellor of the Exchequer laid on the Table certain Papers containing an account of the Civil List expenditure. They were ordered to be printed. He then gave notice, that on Friday next, he should move that the House do resolve itself into a committee of the whole House, to consider so much of the Speech of his Majesty as related to the Civil List.

Mr. *Hume* wished to know whether the right hon. Gentleman intended on that night to propose a vote to the House, or merely to make a statement on which he should afterwards ask for a vote?

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* said, he should on that night move his Resolutions.

Mr. *Hume* remarked, that in that case, the House would be taken by surprise, as they could not in such haste be prepared to vote the Civil List; and if the resolutions were pressed, he should certainly be compelled to take the sense of the House against coming to any decision at that time.

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* said, that the Papers he had just laid on the Table contained full information on the subject.

Sir *James Graham* called the attention of the right hon. Gentleman opposite to the return he had moved for last Session, respecting the salaries, pay, profit, and emoluments of those gentlemen who received more than 1,000*l.* a year. Though his motion had been carried, that return had not yet been made, and the House could not be called on to come to any resolution regarding the Civil List while they were uninformed on that subject.

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* said, that every exertion had been made to complete that return, but two or three names were yet wanting. If the hon. Baronet would consent to receive it in that imperfect state, it could be given to him in a few days at furthest.

Sir *J. Graham* hoped no vote for the Civil List would be called for till that return was furnished.

Mr. *Tennyson* should oppose any vote for the Civil List till the House at large were fully informed upon the plan on which it was to be framed; and he called on the Ministers not to put the House in the situation of appearing to refuse anything to his Majesty, when, in fact, they would only be hesitating about coming to a vote till the Ministers had given them the information they properly required.

Mr. *Maberly* urged the necessity of furnishing the House with all proper information before the vote on the Civil List was called for.

Mr. *Hume* said, if the right hon. Gentleman pressed for a vote on Friday night, he should certainly be obliged to take the sense of the House against it.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, Nov. 11.

MINUTES.] The Duke of BUCKINGHAM, as Lord Steward, laid on the Table a Copy of his Majesty's Reply to the Address presented to him by the House of Lords.

On the Motion of Lord FARNHAM, a Message was sent to the Commons, requesting a Copy of the Report of the Committee which sat last Session, to inquire into the expediency of giving Poor-laws to Ireland.

Petitions presented. For the abolition of Slavery in the Colonies, by the Earl of CARLISLE, from a Parish in Cumberland;—By the Duke of RUTLAND, from a Parish in Cornwall:—By the Earl of LIMERICK, from certain Parishes in the County and City of Limerick:—By the Marquis of CLEVELAND, from a Parish in Durham:—By the Archbishop of CANTERBURY, from several places in Kent:—By Lord BEXLEY, from Shaftesbury, and Parishes in Essex:—By the Bishop of LONDON, from a Parish in his Diocese:—By Lord ARDEN, from certain Inhabitants of Surrey:—By Lord CAWDOR, from places in North Wales:—By the Marquis of LANSDOWN, from Redruth, Lyme Regis, Devizes, Warminster, Truro, Whitby, a Congregation in Keppel-street, Russell-square, the Borough of Montrose, and sundry other places in the Shires of Dorset, Cornwall, Wilts, York, and Devon:—By the Bishop of GLOUCESTER, from several Parishes in Gloucester:—By the Duke of GLOUCESTER, from Wesleyan Methodists in Lincoln's-inn-fields. By Lord TEYNHAM, from Colonel Thornton, of Park-lane, praying for the abolition of the Oaths required of the King and Queen; and of the Declaration against Transubstantiation, which they are now required to make when all their subjects have been released from that obligation.

THE ROYAL VISIT TO THE CITY.] The Earl of *Radnor* wished to ask the noble Duke opposite (Wellington), one or two questions arising out of the expressions which fell from the noble Duke in the Debate on Monday evening. The noble Duke then stated, that he took the determination of advising his Majesty not to visit the City on other grounds and on other information, some of it anonymous, and some of it authenticated, than that he had obtained from the communication of the Lord Mayor. He certainly, at that time, gave the noble Duke credit for having inquired and received good information before he advised his Majesty to adopt a course so calamitous to the metropolis and the country, as to abstain from dining on that occasion with the citizens of London, but he had since learned that the noble Duke had no other information than that to be found in the letter of the Lord Mayor, and that no inquiry had taken place. So little trouble, indeed, did the Government give itself to ascertain the credit due to the statement of the Lord Mayor, that it is now reported that the person who carried the letter of the Secretary of State, postponing his Majesty's visit, was directed to make himself certain that the communication of the Lord Mayor was not a hoax before he delivered the letter of the right hon. Secretary. It was impossible, therefore, under such circumstances, not to feel that the Government betrayed its duty to the Throne and to the people, if it adopted its determination on no better information than that which the noble Duke alluded to; and one of the questions he now wished to ask the noble Duke turned on that very point. The first question was, whether the noble Duke possessed any other information than that communicated already to the House? The second was, whether it was now intended to lay that additional information before their Lordships? The third question was, did his Majesty's Ministers send the letter to the Lord Mayor in the name of his Majesty, without having previously consulted the King on the propriety of the course which they adopted?

The Duke of *Wellington*, before he answered the noble Earl's questions, took leave to express his regret, that the measure which his Majesty's Ministers felt themselves called on to adopt should be characterized by any noble Earl as a calamity. He believed, on the contrary, that the determination taken by the Government on that occasion was now approved of, not only by the majority of the opinions of the Members of both the Upper and Lower Houses of Parliament, but by the infinite majority of the population of the metropolis and the country! The noble Earl had put to him three questions; he would take leave to answer the last before the others. The noble Earl asked if his Majesty was consulted before the right hon. Gentleman, the Secretary for the Home Department, wrote a letter to postpone his Majesty's visit to the City? He (the Duke of Wellington) distinctly stated on a former evening, that his Majesty's pleasure was taken with respect to the propriety of going to the dinner before the letter was written; and he, for one, certainly could not have allowed such a letter to be sent without his Majesty's permission. Another question the noble Earl had been pleased to ask him was this, "whether his Majesty's Government relied on the Lord Mayor's letter as the principal reason for recommending his Majesty not to go to the dinner, or whether they had other information?" Now he stated on Monday evening, that he had received, for many days before that on which the letter of the Lord Mayor was written, a number of communications, some anonymous, and some with signatures, conveying information of intended disturbance, but he certainly had not paid much attention to them until he received the letter of the Lord Mayor. That letter reached him on Saturday, and he certainly felt it his duty to send it immediately to his right hon. friend, the Secretary for the Home Department, who felt it of importance enough to require his immediately entering into a communication with the Lord Mayor respecting its contents; and on the following day his Majesty's Government came to the determination to advise his Majesty to decline going to the dinner. On the evening of the day on which the Debate took place in that House, he received still further information on the same subject, and he stated that he had received it, at the time he explained to the House the course pursued by the Government. The noble Earl, however, asked, if it was the intention of Government to lay that information before the House? He begged, on the part of the Government, to decline laying information of that description before their Lordships. If Parliament had disapproved of the course adopted by the Government, that would be quite another thing, but the Houses of Parliament had not thought proper to censure the conduct of the Government, and therefore he did not think it incumbent on him to produce the information which the noble Earl required. The noble Earl had made some observations respecting the inquiry as to the Lord Mayor's letter being a genuine one. It was perfectly true, that the gentleman deputed to carry the letter of the Secretary of State to the Lord Mayor had directions to make the inquiry; because the circumstances were so extraordinary, that the right hon. Gentleman, although he had had several communications with the Lord Mayor on the subject before, did feel that, on an occasion of so much importance, it was necessary to avoid all possibility of imposition. The question was accordingly asked, and it was established that the Lord Mayor had himself both written and signed the letter. The noble Earl in speaking of the necessity explained by the Lord Mayor of obtaining military assistance, in the event of tumult and disorder, had exclaimed, "Good God! what necessity could there be for military assistance in a city which possessed 40,000 constables?" Why, did not the noble Earl see the City in a state of uproar and confusion throughout the whole of the night, even with their 40,000 constables? The noble Earl was mistaken in the way in which he (the Duke of Wellington) alluded to the possibility of bloodshed. The use he made of the term bloodshed was this: He said, that if there was a riot and confusion in the City, it would become necessary to re-establish the public peace, in order that his Majesty might pass in safety to his Palace; and that for such a purpose he feared that blood must be shed. On all these considerations he felt that the Ministers were fully justified in recommending his Majesty to abstain from incurring the hazard of witnessing such a contest; and he thought they were entitled to as much approbation for sending the letter which the noble Earl condemned as for any other determination ever adopted in the course of their Administration; and for his part, he rejoiced that he had been one of those who recommended his Majesty to avoid the danger which his visit to the City might have produced.

Lord *King* said, that the noble Earl (Radnor) had required further information, and the answer of the noble Duke left their Lordships just as much in the dark as ever they were. The noble Duke could affirm, no less poetically than truly,

> "Gentlemen, I do declare,
> I know no more than the Lord Mayor."

The noble Earl had called the writing of the letter a calamity, and he (Lord King) thought that its effects would prove it to be one. Those noble and hon. persons who composed the Council who sat to deliberate on the occasion seemed to him to be sadly deficient in prudence or common sense, and indeed far below the Council of the City of London. For his own part, he preferred the temperance, the judgment, and the discretion evinced by the Common Council of the City to that of the whole of the ten or twelve Ministers who at present formed the Council of his Majesty.

The Marquis of *Clanricarde* thought the House should not take the bare assertion of the noble Duke, that he possessed further and better information with respect to intentions to disturb the public peace, as being sufficient to justify the Government in giving advice to his Majesty to send a letter which was very little else than an insult to the inhabitants of the City of London. He said, at once, that it was not the King, but the Duke of Wellington, that was likely to receive insult; and what necessity was there that his Grace should accompany his Majesty on such an occasion? Where, too, was the necessity of calling in the new police, which was said to be so much disliked? When the Lord High Admiral visited the City there was no disturbance. There would have been none if the King had visited the City, and if any was apprehended, why could not the King be accompanied by the household troops? For what other purpose was that force kept up? He had visited the City during Tuesday night, and walked through the crowd, and he confessed he saw no disturbance or tendency towards disturbance, except where the new police were stationed. Of disloyalty to the Sovereign, at all events, no trace was to be found at any period of the tumults which he had seen or heard of in any part of the metropolis.

Lord *Wharncliffe* said, he for one must tell the noble Marquis that he gave all approbation and applause to what the Government had done, with reference to the night alluded to. The noble Marquis and others had spoken of the popularity of the King. No man doubted that the King was popular, and that he deserved to be so; but the proceeding which the noble Marquis found fault with had no reference to his Majesty's popularity. The real question was this. Tumult and confusion were expected, and the Government was driven to the necessity of embracing an alternative. They were compelled either to postpone the visit of the Royal Family to the City, or allow it to take place, and adopt measures for the suppression of disorder; but at the same time they would be under the necessity of subjecting the Sovereign and his Consort to the pain of witnessing a conflict between their guards and their subjects. That alternative his Majesty's advisers would not risk, and he approved of their determination. He had witnessed some of these conflicts at other times, and he dreaded the necessity at any time of having recourse to the military power. He was satisfied that it ought never to be employed until the last extremity. Every means should be taken to avoid it; and when it was resorted to, every friend of his country and humanity must regret the necessity.

COAL TRADE.] The Duke of Rutland presented a Petition from Scarborough against the Duty on Sea-borne Coals.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* presented a similar Petition from the lessees, owners, and others connected with the Coal Mines in the vicinity of the Tyne. The petitioners prayed inquiry, and suggested the great benefits which might now be secured to this country if the duties were removed. It was numerously signed, and ought to have weight with the Government. Independent of the injustice of allowing coals to be transmitted by rail-roads free of duty, while the shipping interests were oppressed with a heavy impost, and the commerce of the country materially injured, the noble Marquis pressed on the attention of the House the propriety of endeavouring to secure the custom of those countries which had hitherto been supplied with coals from Belgium, and were now deprived, by the state of that part of the dominions of the king of the Netherlands, of their usual supply. He also alluded to the possibility of increasing the demand from Ireland; and although it was to be lamented that any diminution of the Revenue should take place at a time when the state of Europe rendered it probable that England would require an increase of her expenditure, still he thought the national benefits would be more than commensurate to the loss.

The noble Marquis presented a Petition from the Coal-owners of the county of Durham, to the same effect.

Lord *Teynham* was in favour of the repeal of the Duty on Coals. If that duty were repealed as it concerned Ireland, he was sure that the trade of that country would be increased.

Petitions laid on the Table.

EMPLOYMENT OF LABOURERS.] The Earl of *Winchilsea,* in moving the first reading of the Bill of which he gave notice on Monday last, said that he would make but very few remarks in explanation of the measure. He saw many noble Lords around him who were better qualified than he was, to undertake the important task which he had presumptuously arrogated to himself, that of bringing the question, the very important question, under their consideration, of the great abuses in the Administration of the Poor-laws. It was impossible for any man to trace the abuses of those laws, and the consequences of those abuses in the demoralization of the peasantry, and not be impressed with the necessity of inquiring into those laws, with a view of ascertaining if they could not, by legislative means, at least lessen the abuses, which would otherwise be destructive of the property, and subversive of the best interests of the country. The objects of the Bill which he had to submit were two-fold. It was confined, first, to endeavouring to restore the healthy operation of the existing laws, so as to confine the relief they gave to the classes for whom it was originally intended. The second object of the Bill was, to provide during a certain period of the year; for the Bill was confined to that period of the year which was comprised between the 1st of November and the 1st of May; the second object of the Bill was, to provide employment for the labouring classes; so that they might be enabled to get an honest subsistence, and not be thrown on the poor-rates for support, which were never intended to subsist that description of persons. These were simply and plainly the objects of his Bill. The original intention of the Poor-laws was, to give relief to all those who were unable to help themselves; such as the aged and the infirm, widows and orphans, and the diseased; and it never was contemplated that the law should give relief to stout and able-bodied men. It was the maladministration of these laws, not the laws themselves, which had increased the burthens on the land, and demoralized the people of the agricultural districts. He had had much experience on the subject, and he had by that experience learnt the bad tendency of another and a common practice— that of paying the wages of the labourer out of the poor-rates. That system, he was afraid, pervaded a large extent of country. There was another part of the system which pervaded many districts also, that was equally demoralizing—that was the practice of undertaking to give relief to able-bodied men, who ought not to be relieved. These practices gave an impulse to that bad spirit which was gaining ground in the agricultural districts. As a consequence of this practice of relieving able-bodied men, he had known from thirty to forty in one parish set to work on the roads, and paid at the rate of 6*d.* per day, or even less, by the parish. He was sure, from the conversation he had had with many of the peasantry of that county with which he was connected, that all which they wanted was employment, honest employment, and they would never ask parish assistance or desire parish relief. One great object, then, of his Bill would be, to enable his Majesty's Justices of the Peace, between the 1st of November and the 1st of May, to ascertain the number of unemployed labourers in each parish, and make an assessment on the land for their maintenance and support. The way he proposed to effect this was as follows:—In the month of October, every parish in which there was a prospect of any portion of the labourers being unemployed during the winter, should make a statement to the Justices assembled in Petty Session, and they should include in that statement all the labourers belonging to the parish, and living in or near it, who had nothing but their labour on which to depend for their subsistence, and who, if not employed, might be expected to demand relief from the parish. The labourers should be classed according to the labour they were capable of performing, and they should be paid according to the value of their labour, not in proportion to their family. The plan of giving relief in proportion to the size of a man's family had tended to demoralize the labourers and destroy their independence. According to that system, the best labourer just received as much as sufficed for his maintenance, and the worst labourer received an equal allowance. But the evil of this practice did not stop there. As a single man got no more than a maintenance, and as a married man with a family got also a maintenance, this mode of paying people, in proportion to the size of their families, encouraged those early and improvident marriages which increased the burthen of the poor-rates, and still further injured the peasantry themselves. The object of this Bill would be, to enable his Majesty's Justices to make a separate rate for the employment of labourers, to be called a labour-rate, and out of which the labourers should be paid in proportion to the value of their labour. This rate should extend over the whole of every parish, and such occupiers of land as provided a certain quantity of employment should have what they paid for labour deducted from the rate. So far as for the employment of labourers. The other part of the Bill was to restore the existing laws; and with that view he should propose to confine them to the classes for whose benefit they were originally intended. This was the brief outline of the Bill. He would not detain their Lordships further; but propose that the Bill should be printed, which he had then the honour to lay on their Lordships' Table. He should be happy to consult their Lordships' convenience in naming a day for the second reading of the Bill, and requested that any noble Lord would suggest the day that would be most suitable to their Lordships.

Lord *Suffield* did not mean to enter fully into the discussion of the Bill then submitted to their Lordships; but he could not forbear to make a few observations. He must bear his testimony to the correctness of the picture drawn by the noble Earl of the evil consequences of the Poor-laws on the peasantry. If the noble Earl could accomplish the objects he had at heart, he would confer great advantages on the country: but he was afraid the Bill would not answer the noble Earl's expectations. To one part of it he was friendly, to the other part he was not friendly; and he should not give it his support. It was certainly the abuses of the Poor-laws which had demoralized the labourers, had reduced them to the state of vagabonds, and had disqualified them to raise themselves by their own exertions out of their present abject state. According to the present mode of administering those laws, the labourer who worked much received little; and he who worked little received much. It was not possible for human ingenuity to devise any scheme more destructive of industry; it rooted out all motives for labour. Another evil resulting from these laws, which he was afraid the Bill of the noble Earl would not remedy, was, that the wages of labourers were very insufficient. The Poor-laws had, he thought, a most grievous and injurious operation in that way. But the causes of insufficient wages were various, and were not confined to the Poor-laws. He must say that he did not think the extent of taxation was the cause of low wages. The lowness of wages was occasioned by a deficiency of employment, and if the farmers could employ the labourers advantageously, and with a profit, they would do so. It was because they could not make a profit in employing them, that they did it not. He did not think that evil would be removed by lessening taxation, and could not, therefore, think that taxation was the cause of want of employment. The great evil was a superabundance of labourers above the demand for labour. Many inquiries had been made into the causes of the distress of the labourers, and a committee to inquire was proposed last year, to which he should probably have been opposed, for, in fact, he did not think these causes were involved in any mystery. The subject that needed inquiry was not the causes of the distress, but the remedy for the evil. If any inquiries were now to be instituted, he would recommend a committee to inquire into the means of providing a remedy for the want of employment. It was the duty of the Government, however, to originate measures of relief, and not leave that to individuals. He had reason to find fault with the Ministers for not taking the lead in such matters; they preferred waiting for circumstances. He admired the noble Duke's military character, the great merit of which was, he understood, waiting for the enemy, and he was now afraid that the principle which was admirable for the field was carried by the noble Duke's colleagues into the Cabinet, where it was utterly inexpedient. The great destitution of the people, and their want of occupation, must be remedied by going a step beyond the Poor-laws. Their Lordships must take some means to meet this evil, which was of a tremendous character. The difficulty was, for Parliament to find measures for giving employment to the labourers. The Poor-laws would not afford that. There was one mode, however, of getting rid of a superabundance of labourers, which he thought might be advantageously acted on. We had possessions abroad, and there were other countries which needed people, and he believed that a small portion of the annual sum paid for the Poor-rates would be sufficient to provide employment for the labourers if they were directed to colonise waste lands. The scheme of colonization was that which he approved of, and which he would recommend. He had formerly been one of several gentlemen who had proposed to colonise Southern Africa to a great extent, and they meant to raise 300,000*l.* for this purpose. The Government, however, had been afraid of the extent of their scheme, and took the plan into its own hands; but it failed, from limiting the outlay to the sum of 50,000*l.* The labourers might be employed in cultivating the waste lands of this country, or in colonization. A small portion of the poor-rates, so employed, would do a great deal of good. He believed, too, that the plan of giving a small portion of land to each cottager would be very beneficial. He knew one parish where this had been practised for thirty-six years, and during that time the Poor-rates had only risen 4*d.* an acre, they being at the beginning of that period 2*s.* 6*d.* per acre, and now only 2*s.* 10*d.*, while in other parishes in the neighbourhood the Poor-rates were 10*s.* and 11*s.* an acre. In the parish he had alluded to, however, the population had been much increased, both by fair means and foul—such as perjury, to procure a settlement in the parish, &c., to which the peasantry, unfortunately, were too much accustomed. He would not then enter into the details of the Bill, but when it was printed he would give to those details the most patient investigation.

The Marquis of *Salisbury* differed from the noble Lord, in thinking that the Poor-laws were of themselves good, but that the administration of them had been perverted. He thought the subject required investigation, and it was his intention to give notice of a Motion for a committee to inquire into the Poor-laws, after the recess. That, he thought, was necessary. If they did not find employment for the labourers, it would not be possible to prevent the demoralization of the people. He could not agree, however, to the opinion, that the want of employment arose from over-population. He could not agree to any plan for transporting the agricultural labourers, whom, notwithstanding their demoralization, he considered to be the most valuable portion of our population.

Lord *Suffield* explained, that he did not attribute the evils of want of employment to the Poor-laws themselves, but to the mal-administration of them. At the same time it should be remembered, that when they were passed, the Justices had the power to fix the rate of wages.

Lord *Teynham* wished to make a few observations, because he had long studied the Poor-laws, and was as well acquainted with them as any man in England. He contended that the 43rd of Elizabeth was a most benevolent and wise law, intended, like all her laws, to promote the happiness of her people. The noble Lord had stated that taxation had had no influence on the Poor-laws: he thought quite differently. It was since the American war, when taxation had increased so much, that the condition of the agricultural labourer was deteriorated, and he conceived that deterioration had been mainly caused by two measures of finance. These two measures were, the duties on hops and the duties on malt, which had prevented the poor man from brewing his own beer, and driven him from his cottage. When he had ceased to be a brewer he had ceased also to be a baker, and then had to go to the shop and the ale-house for all his food and drink. He had heard that the farmers around Battle, and that the farmers in several parts of Kent, had agreed to give their labourers 15*s.* a week. They had met and resolved to do this in consequence of intimidation. He doubted the efficacy of the noble Earl's Bill, and would recommend the Government to come to the help of the Poor-laws. It was a cruel thing that the property in land was so excessively burthened; and he would also recommend that the Government should tax funded property to support the poor. He was, on the whole, glad to see their Lordships disposed to take the Poor-laws into consideration, as he was sure that, unless that were done, the agricultural districts would be ruined.

The Duke of *Richmond* rose, not to discuss the Bill of his noble friend, because he had not yet heard it read, but to deny the statement of the noble Lord who had just taken his seat. The noble Lord was not authorised to make that statement, as he was sure that he could not prove it. He did not deny that the farmers of Kent and Sussex might have agreed to raise the wages of their labourers, but he denied that they had done so from the motive of intimidation. The farmers of Kent and Sussex were not accessible to such motives, and he hoped the noble Lord would give them credit for nobler motives. He rose chiefly for the purpose of contradicting that assertion, and he would not discuss the Bill of his noble friend. He differed entirely from the noble Lord in thinking that the Government should have anything to do with the administration of the Poor-laws, for they were the last things he wished the Government to take the management of into its own hands. In his opinion, an inquiry into the Poor-laws, and their administration, would be much better conducted by a Committee of the Lords and Commons than by a Government Commission. The noble Marquis (Salisbury) had said, that he intended, after the recess, to introduce a motion for an inquiry into the subject, but he hoped the noble Marquis would find it convenient and proper to bring it forward sooner. A noble friend of his (Lord Suffield) had remarked, that the main cause of the distresses of the poor, and the low rate of wages, was plain enough; that it was the superabundance of labour, compared with the demand for it. But then there were many who differed about the causes, and it was necessary that others besides the Ministers, and persons whose residence was chiefly in town, should be examined. What did the Ministers and those who resided chiefly in London, Brighton, Cheltenham, and such other places, know about the operation of the Poor-laws? It was necessary to have inquiry made in order to call the attention of Government to the subject, and to enlighten those who did not understand it. He did not agree with those who might think that the repeal of taxes would have little effect in relieving the distress of the people. He did not think, however, that it was particularly requisite to reduce materially the tax on hops, because that was an article in which there was no reason to dread a competition; but he should be very glad of a reduction or repeal of the tax on malt, and on other articles, and he was satisfied that a reduction might be made without loss to the revenue, as the consumption would be increased. He hoped the Government would consider whether something might not be done in the way of repealing, reducing, or equalizing taxes. He thought it right to throw out these few words, but he should hardly have risen, had it not been to repel the attack on the yeomanry of the counties of Kent and Sussex.

Lord *Teynham* took all that the noble Duke had said in good part, as he was sure that the noble Duke could never mean to say anything that was not parliamentary. But still he must persist in the opinion which he had given—which was, that the yeomanry of those counties had raised their wages, not out of choice, but compulsion. He had received a letter to that effect from a most respectable individual, well acquainted with the circumstances, in which it was stated, that the farmers had been forced to promise fifteen shillings a week, although they could not pay it, and he was ready to produce that individual at the Bar if required to do so.

Lord *Stourton* thought the question one of deep concern to the country, and any suggestion, coming from any quarter, to ameliorate the condition of the labouring classes, would not fail to interest the feelings, and excite the sympathy of their Lordships. He agreed with those who thought that distress was not universally prevalent. He could say, at least, that the people who lived in the quarter where he resided were in as good circumstances as they had been for the last thirty years. Having himself a good deal of land in his own hands, he had laid his books before him, and compared the remuneration which the labourers received, and the prices which they paid for provisions; and he could take upon himself to say, that at no time for these last thirty years were they in better circumstances. He mentioned this in order to shew that the Poor-laws themselves were not the cause of the evils: even the abuse of the Poor-laws in the administration of them was rather symptomatic of the evil, than its cause. The real cause of the evil lay deeper; and he agreed with the noble Lord near him (Suffield) who found it in the superabundance of labour above the demand—in other words, the surplus of unemployed labourers. That prevailed to a most lamentable extent in Ireland, and from Ireland it spread into this country. If, then, they intended to apply an effectual remedy, they must go to the root of the evil. Unless they did this, they did nothing; for the noxious weed of poverty would burst through every regulation of a different description. The labourers must be in a comfortable condition all over the empire, otherwise they could not very long remain in comfort in any particular quarter. Suppose you could place Poland where Ireland was now, and could pour the corn into this country, still the steam bridge across the Irish Channel would afford access to this country of immense numbers of unemployed labourers, and it would be impossible by any regulations to keep them back; for you could not pass a Non-intercourse Act between the different quarters of the same empire. He was sorry to have to trouble their Lordships at so much length. He did not mean to say whether the Poor-laws ought to be introduced into Ireland. He did not feel that he was sufficiently acquainted with Ireland to be able to give a confident opinion on the question. But he was rather disposed to think that these laws might be partially introduced in Ireland; that was, by confining the parochial relief to the aged and the infirm. He appealed to the Government, whether some means might not be adopted to provide employment for the poor of Ireland—especially as the Government itself would derive great advantage from it in the way of taxation. There was, as he understood, a great deal of land in Ireland that might be reclaimed from rivers, &c., and the operation would afford employment to multitudes of labourers, who might be located and colonized on the lands when reclaimed. It was well known that the middle-men were in the habit of letting to the peasants the borders of bogs; and, in truth, the Irish peasantry, in the present circumstances, must have land, or they could have nothing, for they could not get employment. From this state of things mendicity rose of necessity, and forced the labourers over to this country; and it was in vain to hope to check them, for the steam would burst all barriers. He hoped he had not expressed himself in such a way as to occasion unpleasant feeling in any quarter. He felt exceedingly grateful to the noble Duke for bringing forward the great measure of 1829, and he had expected that it would be attended with the best effects on the industry of Ireland, by attracting British capital to that country, and he had only to lament that the agitation which had been raised lately in that country had in some degree disappointed his hopes, and deprived Ireland of many of the advantages which it would otherwise have derived from that wise and healing measure. But after the Union with Scotland, the latter country had, in the same manner, been for some time deprived of the benefits of that Union by the discords of parties. When the party dissensions had ceased, which, for a time deprived Scotland of the beneficial influence of that measure, it derived from it the greatest advantages. So the Union with Ireland, which was yet in its infancy, and the benefits of which had been destroyed by party dissensions, would come, he hoped, to be mutually beneficial. He hoped, indeed, that the time was not far off when the measure would attain its full manhood—when the obstacles would be thrown down, and Ireland reap the full benefits of the Union. These dissensions and agitations acted at present in Ireland like the virus of typhus fever, but he hoped that the political, like the natural virus, would be expelled by plenty of food and raiment.

Lord *Carbery* was decidedly opposed to a repeal of the Union, for a repeal of the Union would lead to a separation of the two countries, and that would lead to the destruction of both. The salvation of both depended on their remaining united. He agreed that the agitation in Ireland had been a serious obstacle to the investing of British capital in that country; for that required tranquillity, and could not be established in the midst of the agitation, which was now unhappily raised by men who had other objects in view than the prosperity of Ireland. He himself knew instances in which preparations had been made, immediately after passing the Relief Bill for investing capital in Ireland, and these preparations had been suspended in consequence of these agitations.

Viscount *Gort* was also opposed to the dissolution of the union between the two countries. No man had more ardently opposed the Union at the time it was first brought forward, than he had, but he did not feel himself called upon to say whether if he were placed in the same circumstances again, he would have acted in the same manner. As matters now stood, however, he was fully persuaded that the dissolution of the Union would be attended with the destruction of both countries. The scenes at Clare and Waterford had shown what kind of legislators Ireland would have, if the Union were dissolved. When the Speaker of the Irish House of

Commons put the question, that the Union Bill should pass, there were some in the House, and those of considerable legal learning, who gave their opinion that the measure might be resisted by force. He at that time had the command of a military body; and he then stated, that as the measure had been passed by a majority of the House, and would, no doubt, be adoped by the whole Parliament, he would submit to it, and would defend it with all his power, as he would have defended a measure of which he should have fully approved. He stated this, in order to show that there was no inconsistency on his part in now decidedly opposing a repeal of the Union.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* was desirous of explaining, as this point seemed misunderstood, that his Bill applied only to those parishes where there were able-bodied, unemployed labourers, and not to any others. He was persuaded, that the yeomanry neither of Kent nor Sussex to whom allusion had been made, had done anything improper.

The Duke of *Wellington* assured the noble Lords who pressed this matter upon the attention of Government, that the Government had not been inattentive to the subject. The real truth was, that the administration of the Poor-laws was so various in different places, that it was impossible to find out where the evil lay, or to prepare any one measure which would apply to all, for what would answer in one place would not answer in another. A noble Duke had said, that the Ministers knew nothing about the administration of the Poor-laws; and it was true that they could not well know how they were administered in every parish, when the modes of administration were so exceedingly various. But the variety of these modes proved how very difficult it must be to find out a general remedy. He agreed in what had been stated respecting the consequences of the resort of the superabundant unemployed Irish to this country; but there again it was extremely difficult to find a remedy. The noble Lord opposite (Suffield) had himself suggested two remedies, or plans, which he thought would be attended with advantage in Norfolk; but it did not follow that what would be a beneficial plan in Norfolk would answer in Kent and Sussex. The Government, however, felt every disposition to do all that lay in its power to remedy the evils which had been the subject of so much complaint.

The Duke of *Richmond* was glad to find it now admitted on all sides, that his motion of last year was not a factious one.

The Marquis of *Salisbury* felt himself bound to say, that he had heard from a person of considerable influence in the Government, that if the noble Duke's Motion had been confined to an inquiry into the state of the Poor-laws, he would not have opposed it.

The Duke of *Richmond:* Then the Government ought to have moved as an amendment, that the latter part should be left out.

The Bill read a first time, to be printed, and read a second time, on Tuesday week.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, Nov. 11.

MINUTES.] Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. BERNAL, of the Claims of British subjects on France in 1793, which have been satisfied, and Accounts connected therewith:—On the Motion of Mr. Alderman WAITHMAN, of the daily Employ and Service of the several Ships or Vessels undermentioned, belonging to, or employed by his Majesty's Ordnance, from the 20th day of July, 1830, to the 10th day of August, 1830, inclusive; viz. the Ebenezer of Woolwich, Chatham of Purfleet, Fanny of Woolwich, Harmony of Chatham, Wellington of Upnor, and Ligonier of same. Also, an Address for Copy of the Record of Conviction of William Edwards, at the Rochester Sessions, 1824, who was found guilty of Smuggling, and sentenced to five years service on board the Prince Regent; also, a Report of whether he served such time; and if not, when, and under what circumstances he left; and whether he has since served out the said time, or received, and from whom, and when, a remission of the remainder, or any part of his sentence.

On the Motion of Mr. SLANEY, a Bill for the better rating Tenements under a certain annual value, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Slaney, Lord Viscount Althorp, and Sir Thomas Freemantle, and was brought in accordingly.

On the Motion of Mr. BRISCOE, the Settlement of the Poor Bill was read a second time.

Petitions presented. By Mr. H. DAVIS, from a Parish in Bristol, for a Repeal of the House and Window Tax. By Mr. WRIGHTSON, from Kingston-upon-Hull, for a Repeal of the Coast Duty on Coals. By Sir R. BATESON, from certain Cotton Weavers in the County of Down, for means to Emigrate to the Colonies. For the abolition of Colonial Slavery, from Durham, by Mr. A. TAYLOR:—By Mr. LITTLETON, seventy from Staffordshire:—By Sir H. BUNBURY, twelve from Suffolk:—By Mr. EVANS, sixty-four from Leicester:—By Sir C. LEMON, two from Penryn:—By Mr. STEWART, from Derby:—By Sir W. INGILBY, 150 from the County of Lincoln:—By Mr. RUSSELL, sixteen from the County of Durham:—By Mr. BELL, four from Northumberland:—By Mr. G. LAMB, from Melbourn, in Derbyshire:—By Mr. HOY, two from Southampton, and one from Jersey:—By Lord W. POWLETT, forty-three from Durham:—By Mr. R. GRANT, forty from Norwich:—By Sir T. ACLAND, thirty-six from Devon:—By Lord NORREYS, from Kiddington, Oxfordshire:—By Sir C. TYRELL, twenty from Suffolk:—By Mr. D. SYKES, from Hull and the neighbourhood:—By Mr. O'CONNELL, from Huncote, Lancashire:—By Mr. N. CALVERT, three from Parishes in Hertfordshire:—By Mr. RICKFORD, from a Parish in Buckinghamshire:—By Lord

Morpeth, 254 from various parts of Yorkshire:—By Mr. Bethel, twenty-nine, from various parts of the same County:—By Mr. Western, twenty from Parishes in Essex:—By Colonel Tyrell, two from the same County: —By Mr. Byng, from Kingsland, and nine other places in Middlesex:—By Sir J. Graham, from Cockermouth, and another place in Cumberland:—By Mr. Spring Rice, from Parishes in Limerick:—By Mr. Dickinson, from the Archdeacon and Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Wells:—By Mr. Calcraft, two from Wareham and the neighbourhood:—By Mr. Stanley, from Preston:—By Mr. Brownlow, from Smeddeyhaugh, Scotland:—By Lord Sandon, from the Inhabitants of Sandon:—By Mr. Ryder, from Randwick:—By Lord Acheson, from Gillingham, Herringham, and five other Parishes. By Mr. O'Connell, from the Hatters and Feltmakers of Carlow, complaining of Distress, and praying for a Repeal of the Legislative Union; and a similar Petition from Persons resident in London. By the same hon. Member, from John Mahene, of Dundalk, complaining of the Magistrates of that place. By Mr. Wilks, from the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of Dorsetshire, holding their annual conference at Shaftesbury, praying for Jewish Emancipation. By Mr. Hume, from the Masons of Lanark, praying for a Reform in Parliament. By Mr. Denison, from the Parish of St. Mary, Newington, complaining of the Expense of the Metropolitan Police.

Agricultural Distress — Taxation.] Mr. *Hodges* presented a petition from the Mayor, Jurats and Commonalty, householders, and inhabitants of the town and hundred of Tenterden, Kent praying for the reduction of taxation. A more important petition he observed, had not been presented for some time to the House. He said this in consideration of the place from whence it came—a part of the county of Kent, which had recently been the scene of very unpleasant transactions, and in consideration of the feelings which had dictated it, the almost desperate situation of the inhabitants of that part of the country having called forth the petition. With the leave of the House he would read it, which the hon. Member did as follows:

> "That the agricultural interest has for many years past been in so depressed a condition, that farmers have not been enabled to afford to pay their labourers at the usual rate of remuneration for their work, and that thereby many industrious labouring men have become burthens to their parishes, and in many places been reduced to privation and distress. That your petitioners are desirous of calling the attention of your honourable House to the subject, that the distress is daily increasing; and they, therefore, most humbly intreat your honourable House to institute an inquiry into the causes of the present agricultural distress. Your petitioners further take leave respectfully to suggest, that the great burthen on landholders may, in some measure, be removed, by lowering the rate of tithes. Your petitioners further entreat, your earnest endeavours towards effecting a reform in the Members of your honourable House, also a reduction of the taxes. That your petitioners are impressed with a lively sense of the sacrifice which his most gracious Majesty has recently made to the wants and distresses of his people—an example which your petitioners consider well worthy of imitation. That your petitioners beg to assure your honourable House of their loyalty to his Majesty and his most gracious Consort."

This was the prayer of a Corporation that he had known for upwards of forty years to have been distinguished by almost invariable professions and principles of attachment to what were called Ministerial principles. He was convinced, that a very few years ago this petition would not have received one of the numerous signatures which were now attached to it. He remembered that town when it was one of the most flourishing and wealthy in the whole county, and at present it was involved in the deepest distress. He stated the plain fact which, he trusted, would be credited on his assertion. At the head of this petition was the signature of a person whose loyalty had never been exceeded, even by that of any hon. Member of that House; but he, in common with all his neighbours, was so strongly impressed with the necessity of a reform, and of something being done to alleviate the distress, that he had willingly signed the petition. He believed, indeed, that the distress complained of in the petition existed everywhere. The impression in this district on the mind of the landholder was, that having heavy poor-rates to pay, and heavy taxes of one sort or another, he could not pay his workmen as he otherwise would. That was the situation of the people about the place from whence this petition came. He had lived in Kent for some time, and he knew that the distress in that county at present was not exceeded in any part of Europe. Though the labourer might be receiving in some cases 12*s*. a week for his work, he was in a very different situation from that in which he had known him to be. He recollected him in a state of perfect independence, when an able-bodied man who was willing to work, never wanted employment; and when he was able to live comfortably without asking relief from anybody. How was it now? A man with 12*s*. a week at the very utmost, and a wife and family to support, must come upon the parish. It was quite clear, unless some reduction in taxation took place, some relief was afforded, comfort and tranquillity could never be restored; and agriculture could never return to its former state. He would not ask the right hon. Secretary of State whether he really believed in the existence of the distress, and in its gradual increase; he was perfectly sure that every man of common understanding was aware of that fact. For fifteen years he would venture to say, the country had been gradually getting into a worse condition, and it was now reduced to such a state, that unless measures of the most prompt and effectual description were resorted to, it would be utterly impossible to foretell the consequences. If a very great retrenchment were not made, and very shortly, the tranquillity of England would be put to hazard. Under these circumstances, he looked forward with the utmost anxiety to the plan of Ministers, for he was quite certain that the prosperity of the country would be compromised for many years if large retrenchment and large reform were not conceded to the people.

Ordered to lie on the Table.

CASE OF DR. PHILLPOTTS.] Lord *Belgrave* said:—I have been requested by the Very Rev. Dean of Chester to make a communication of some importance to the House. In doing so, I think it right to state, that I have no intimate acquaintance with that reverend personage; but from what I know of his character, I have considered it due to him to accede to his request. The rev. gentleman says, in a letter which he has addressed to me, that he should esteem it a very great favour if I would state in the House of Commons this evening, that he earnestly requests hon. Members will suspend their judgments upon the question which is to be brought forward about him on the 18th, until they have heard those statements which he ventures to hope will be found satisfactory to the House. In the mean time, he trusts that those *ex parte* allegations which have appeared in the newspapers and elsewhere, and to which it must be evident that he cannot reply, will not be allowed to bias the judgments of those who have to pronounce upon the case. For my own part, I have no hesitation in calling upon the House to do this,—namely, to suspend their judgments. This is all I ask of the House, for I am not acquainted with the facts of the case, and shall certainly exercise my judgment upon the merits of it, when the statements to which the reverend gentleman refers shall be brought forward.

SUBLETTING ACT.] Mr. *O'Connell* rose, pursuant to notice, to move for leave to bring in a Bill to repeal the Statute 7 George 4th, cap. 29, commonly called the Subletting Act. He pursued this course because he was convinced that, if there were anything objectionable in the Act—and it was admitted on all hands that there was—it would be better to bring in a new Statute at once, than to attempt to patch up the old one. This Statute was the law in Ireland, but it was not the law in England, and he thought he had a right to have a case made out why the law of landlord and tenant should be different in the two countries. This Act had two objects in view, and it might be, for convenience—nay, it ought to be, for convenience,—divided into two Statutes. The first part of the Act related to existing leases and contracts; the second, to leases and contracts to be hereafter made. The first part of the Act altered the nature of contracts then subsisting, by giving a literal meaning to the words of contracts; whereas a legal meaning, which was a different meaning, attached to those words before. This was an unjust, because an *ex post facto* law, and the object of it was to strike out of contracts a qualification which was advantageous to the tenants. He knew that some Gentlemen had said that they liked the principle of this Act, though they objected to the details of it. Could any one say, that he liked the principle of this part of the Act—the dishonest principle of an *ex post facto* law, which violated existing engagements? The second part of the Statute, he admitted, was purely prospective, and that was a legitimate mode of legislating, which the other was not. This part of the Act prohibited the subletting of lands in Ireland, except in three cases. The excepted cases, were, first, lands held on leases for lives renewable for ever; secondly, lands held on a term of ninety-nine years; thirdly, all lands belonging to the Church. With these three exceptions, the Act operated universally. Why, he should like to know, was the law to interfere between the landlord and the tenant? Why not allow the landlord and the tenant to make what contracts they pleased between themselves? This Act had taken away the freedom of the only trade they had in Ireland,—namely, the trade in land. He might be told, that the Act did not do this in words. He admitted this, but such was, in fact, the operation of the Act. It said, that the landlord should no longer distrain upon the under-tenant, and of course no landlord would consent to lose the remedy of distraining upon the occupied land. The question, after all, came to this—ought the law to interfere between landlord and tenant? He thought not. But it was said that this law was good, because it would enable land-owners to clear their estates. This was the argument of heartless and unfeeling men, who thought it better to support upon an estate a great many beasts, and very few human beings, than a large population. However, let it be understood, that in applying for the repeal of this Act, he did not propose to take away from the landlord the right of clearing his estate. That right would remain with the landlord still, who could exercise it, if he thought proper, in its fullest extent; only it was not, he contended, the part of a considerate and humane Government to make itself the auxiliary of the landlord, to compel him to clear his estate, and thus to take away from the landlord the reproach of inhumanity and hard-heartedness. He was free to confess, that he did not believe this Act to have been an act of the Government. He looked upon it as originating in some political left-handed intrigue of heartless men. From the period of the Union until the present, all the Statutes enacted by the Legislature had had for their object the oppression of the peasantry, and the giving advantages to the landlord. The Statutes which enabled the landlord to distrain growing crops, and which conferred upon him the power of ejecting a tenant at an extremely small expense, were of this description, and had been among the main causes of the evils of the poor in Ireland, and consequently, of the disturbances which had unfortunately taken place in that country. The Statutes first enabled the landlord to ruin his tenant, and then to turn him out cheaply. He might be told, that this Act was made for the purpose of creating large farms, and then there might be repeated to him long dissertations upon the beneficial effects of large farms. If to cause universal mendicity among the peasantry was to produce a beneficial effect, then, indeed, there would be some truth in these dissertations, and some sense in the pages of evidence which unfeeling men had given in favour of cultivating sheep and cattle instead of human beings. While he was upon this subject, let him mention an act which it gave him the greatest satisfaction to record. So great had been the increase of beggars, that the Mendicity Association of Dublin must have closed its doors if the Duke of Northumberland had not presented it with a donation of 1,000*l.* He meant a donation not out of the public money, but out of his Grace's private purse. He could state further, that after that sum of 1,000*l.* was exhausted, the Association had been kept going by the private contributions of a member of his Grace's family—a female, whose name he would not, of course, mention. He knew these facts to be as he had stated them. But to return to this Statute, of which, he repeated, the effect had been, to increase mendicity to an alarming extent, it was a political economy measure, not a Government Act. Its professed object was, to create large farms, and this, the political economist said, was a great good. He would meet these Gentlemen upon the fact—the Act had not created large farms. It prevented labourers being employed, for if the landlord gave the labourer a holding, the labourer might keep it. Unless, therefore, in the neighbourhood of lands excepted from the operation of the Act, no large farms could exist, because the owners would not risk the employment of the number of labourers necessary to cultivate them. To the operation of this Act was to be traced the erroneous notion that there was a superabundance of labour in Ireland. There was no natural superabundance of labour in that country; the superabundance of labour was artificial, and caused by bad laws and bad government. If such a state of things were allowed to continue, he apprehended—however dangerous the admission might appear—a servile war in Ireland of the worst description. The hon. Member concluded by moving for leave to bring in his Bill.

Mr. *Doherty*, after claiming the indulgence of the House on account of indisposition, said, that he begged to remind hon. Members, that on the passing of this Act it was admitted on all hands that there was something in the condition of

Ireland which required that the law of landlord and tenant in the two countries should be different. This he thought he could show by authorities of a very high character; but in saying this, let it not be supposed that he was insensible to the propriety of generally assimilating, as nearly as possible, the laws of the two countries. He thought it would have been better if this motion of the hon. and learned Member had been postponed. The noble Lord (the late Secretary for Ireland) had given notice of a measure for the Amendment of this Act in the last Session; and in the present Session his right hon. friend (the present Secretary for Ireland) had given notice of a similar motion. The House must see, therefore, that the Government intended that the Act should not remain as it was; and he thought that much time and discussion might have been saved, if the hon. and learned Member had waited till he had seen how the Act would stand when it should have received the contemplated amendments. However, the hon. and learned Member was opposed to the principle of the Act, and the present was, of course, as convenient a time as any other for discussing that principle. He did not think that, in dealing with the principle of this Act, the hon. and learned Member need have arraigned the whole of the legislative enactments on the subject of landlord and tenant which had passed since the Union; and he must confess that it was with the greatest surprise that he had heard the hon. and learned Member, who had so often boasted himself to be a legal reformer, and an advocate for cheap law, find fault with those Acts which had made law cheap in Ireland. That was the object of some of the Acts which the hon. and learned Member had condemned, and he himself had, on a former occasion, admitted that by one of these Acts the expenses of an ejectment had been diminished from 17*l.* to 1*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* Where the landlord had a clear right, it was thought that he might be allowed to seek his remedy in the County Courts, which, in Ireland, were above suspicion. This was a principle which the hon. and learned Member had himself advocated in speaking of legal reform; upon one of which occasions the hon. and learned Gentleman had insisted upon the hardship of making a man send up from a remote part of England to London for a piece of parchment, without which the man could not prosecute his just claims. Was it not quite as great a hardship to make a man send from Cork or from Waterford to Dublin for the like piece of parchment? Applying that principle to the law of ejectment, a worthy and hon. Baronet, whom, he believed, he saw in his place [*Sir J. Newport bowed*], introduced a bill, by which the County Courts had authority to determine cases of ejectment. That Act might be said to be a boon to the landlord, but it was a gain to the tenant. It was said, indeed, that nothing was to be got from the Irish tenant. Yes, something was to be got—his liberty; for his person might be seized for the costs, which, to gratify his own obstinacy, or in accordance with the artful suggestions of a knavish attorney, he had had the temerity to incur. As to the Act which allowed distress on growing crops in Ireland, that was an assimilation of the law in the two countries; such a law having existed in England since the reign of George 2nd; and as the hon. and learned Member had contended for assimilation, he did not see with what consistency or reason the hon. and learned Member had found fault with that Act. Now, as to the Subletting Act, the subject of the hon. and learned Member's motion, the history of that Act would perhaps furnish the best vindication of it. In 1824 and 1825 two Select Committees were appointed to inquire into the state of Ireland. All the hard-hearted and unfeeling persons, to whom the hon. and learned Member had referred—all the witnesses who had been examined before those committees, and many of them were men of talent and integrity—agreed that the poor of Ireland were sadly and unnaturally depressed: all of them applied their talents and experience to the discovery of the means by which the condition of the peasantry of Ireland might be improved. All of them, too, whatever other differences of opinion there might have been among them, agreed upon this one point; namely, that the chief cause of the evils of the poor of Ireland was the almost unlimited subdivision of property in that country. In that opinion he concurred, and was ready to contend that the infinite subdivision of land in Ireland had been one of the main causes of the evils under which that country laboured. All the witnesses agreed in describing the rooted obstinacy with which the great body of the people fastened themselves on the land as their sole means of support. Farms that had been let of a size sufficient for good husbandry, and in proportion to the capital a man might be expected to employ on them, had been divided by their first occupants among their sons and daughters, who had subdivided their portions again among their children, till the land was so parcelled out that no one portion of it could possibly supply more than the bare necessaries of life, to its wretched occupant, whose condition was reduced to a level with that of the beasts which perish. That was the opinion universally expressed by the several respectable witnesses examined before the committee on the state of Ireland in 1825. He had thought it his duty to look at their testimony and he found none more touching or more conclusive than that of the hon. and learned member for Waterford himself. The learned Member, in his evidence before that committee, gave a most appalling description of the miserable and wretched condition to which the Irish peasantry had been reduced; and but that he feared to fatigue the House he would read some of that hon. and learned Member's testimony [*"Read, Read."*] As it was the wish of the House, he would read a portion of it. He found the following passages in that hon. Member's evidence before the Committee.

> "Have you had opportunities of becoming acquainted with the condition of the lower orders of the people of Ireland, in an extensive district of that country?—I may venture to say that I have had many, and long.
>
> "Have you observed any great increase of numbers in the districts with which you are acquainted?—Very great; I know many instances, in the remote parts particularly; for example, I know of farms upon which I remember but two dwellings; I speak of two farms that I have on my mind at this moment, upon which there is, I believe, at present, nearly a hundred families.
>
> "What, under your observation, is the state of the lower orders with respect to their modes of living?—The state of the lower orders, in my observation, is such, that it is astonishing to me how they preserve health; and, above all, how they preserve cheerfulness under the total privation of anything like comfort, and the existence of a state of things that the inferior animals would scarcely endure, and which they do not endure in this country.
>
> "What is the general state of the habitations of the lower class?—It is impossible, I think (I express myself strongly), it would be extremely difficult to have anything worse. The houses are not even called houses, and they ought not to be: they are called cabins. They are built of mud, and covered with thatch partly, and partly with a surface which they call scraws, &c.
>
> What sort of furniture have they in those houses?—Nothing that can deserve the name of furniture.
>
> "With regard to their bedding, what does it consist of?—Nothing but straw, and very few blankets in the mountain district.
>
> "Have they blankets put over the straw, sufficient to cover them?—In general, not.

In another part the hon. and learned Member's answers were equally explicit.

> "Have circumstances occurred, within your knowledge, of hardship in respect of distraining for rent?—Very many.
>
> "Is it a general hardship in the country?—It is a general grievance, very much aggravated by the necessity of sub-letting. There are frequently six or seven between the proprietor of the fee and the actual occupier, and whenever any two of them happen to differ in the state of their accounts, the man who claims more than the other has paid, or is willing to pay, settles the dispute by distraining the actual occupier; and that occurs in many instances where the occupier has paid his own rent to his own landlord.
>
> "Then every superior tenant of the subtenants has a right to distress over the actual occupier?—Unquestionably."

Such was the hon. and learned member for Waterford's own description of the state of the Irish peasant in 1825. It clearly established his very miserable condition—it established too the fact of the minute and almost infinite subdivision of land, as well as the vexation and grievance of subjecting the wretched occupant of the soil to be distrained by the many persons who intervened between him and the lord of the soil; and that all the grievances of the peasantry were greatly aggravated by the practice of subletting. He need hardly observe, then, that all these evils did not flow from the Subletting Act, which, at that time, had not only not passed, but was not in contemplation, unless it could be said, that in Ireland effects preceded their cause. It having been established, on indisputable evidence, that such was the miserable condition of the Irish peasantry, he appealed to the heart of every man who heard him, were these things to be suffered so to remain without one effort to ameliorate them? Whatever might be supposed, things could not remain as they were, for each year brought with it a fresh subdivision of the land, and every subdivision diminished the means of supporting the miserable occupiers. It was then inquired, " If these ills be so clearly attributable to the subdivision and underletting of ground, why do not the landlords of Ireland take measures to prevent it?" The landlords replied, that they had done so, but without effect, for they found that some legal difficulty interposed, which took from them the power to restrain their tenants from underletting. Men of great talent and eminence at the Irish Bar, Serjeant Blackburn, Messrs. Blacker and Bennett, were examined before the committee to explain the nature of this legal difficulty. They attributed it to what was called the doctrine of waiver, and the law which had been established by a long train of decisions upon that subject. It would be his duty, if he could hope that the House would bear with him, to attempt the difficult task of explaining this purely professional and technical point:—He would merely observe, that it had been established by decisions, that if A make a lease of his land to B, upon condition that if B alienate, assign, or underlet it, A may re-enter and possess it; and if afterwards A gave B permission to underlet it to any one individual then B might underlet that land to thousands and A could never avail himself of the condition which he had, by the permission to underlet to one person, what is in law called " waived." That was the result of the law, as established by what was called Dumpar's case. It was abundantly absurd, but it was, nevertheless, the law. Thus, if a man let a farm to another, relying upon his personal skill and integrity, and added a condition that he should forfeit the farm if he let it to another, and was afterwards induced to grant permission to underlet to some one individual, on whom, perhaps, he had an equal reliance, the tenant could thenceforth be at liberty to underlet it to whom he pleased. Besides this, which was termed an express waiver, many other acts of the landlord had been construed by the Courts to amount to implied waivers: the Judges having apparently been disposed to favour subletting, so that between the state of the law, the leaning of Courts, and the prejudices of Juries (more interested as tenants than landlords), it had become practically almost impossible to restrain tenants from underletting their lands in Ireland. A gentleman, whose name was not unknown to the Members of that House, and whose zeal and activity for the improvement of Ireland was acknowledged, on being examined before that same committee—he alluded to Mr. Blake, the Chief Remembrancer of the Court of Exchequer in Ireland—in the course of his evidence he pointed out the simple, but effectual, remedies which he would apply to the law; and from his suggestions Lord Plunkett, the then Attorney-general for Ireland, framed this Act of Parliament, which had been so much misunderstood by some, so much reprehended by others, but which, rightly considered, conferred benefits both on the landlord and tenant, and infinitely greater upon the tenant than upon the landlord. On the landlord it conferred the advantage of not having his land underlet without his permission; but it protected the occupier of the soil against an evil, pregnant with ruin and annoyance,—the liability to continued and repeated distrainings, even when he may have paid his rent, for the arrears of all those who might stand betwixt him and the owner of the soil. The first section of the Act provided that no tenant who had covenanted not to underlet should do so without the express permission in writing of his landlord; it did away with the absurdity of implying waivers from acts of the landlord, which never were intended by him so to operate, and it put an end to the still greater absurdity already described as too long established by the rule in Dumpar's case,—a rule, the existence of which the Judges had more than once lamented, though they had left to the Legislature the credit of overruling it. A subsequent section provided, that when the landlord permits his tenant to underlet, the tenant in possession shall be subject only to be distrained by his own immediate landlord; thus affording an invaluable boon to the real occupants of the land. These were the two great principles of the Act; and such, with some enactments of minor importance, calculated to give them effect, would be the Act when amended in the manner proposed by his right hon. friend the Secretary for Ireland. The Act conferred no power whatever on a landlord to dispossess a tenant; it was a confusion, a mistake, or something worse, to say that it did; indeed, he had not understood the hon. and learned member for Waterford to assert, in his place that night, that any such effect could be attributed to it, as that hon. Member knew full well that no tenant had been, that no tenant could be, dispossessed by means of this Act. Long before it was passed, the landlords of Ireland began to discover the folly, not to say the disgrace, of having the peasantry on their estates in the most miserable condition, such as had been described; and from time to time, as their farms fell out of lease, they made efforts to consolidate and enlarge them. This led to the dispossessing of many persons, though he trusted it had been nowhere done with a harsh and hasty hand, but in the most kind and considerate manner. It had been necessarily productive, as he admitted, of great suffering, but surely it was not fair to attribute that to the then unpassed Subletting Act. It was painful, God knew, to have to strike a balance as to the amount of rival and conflicting suffering, but one must see, that the misery of the peasantry, while they were left to increase and multiply upon the land, was a misery without a prospect of diminution, or rather with a certainty of increase; but whatever might be the present sufferings of the expelled population (and he was far from undervaluing them) beyond the black cloud that now pressed heavily upon the country, there was opening the brighter prospect of a comfortable, substantial, and contented peasantry. No man who heard him make that observation would attribute to him a callousness to present suffering, or any want of cordial co-operation for its alleviation. He would willingly forego every pursuit of interest or ambition, if he thought that, by the devotion of his time, he could devise any mode of diminishing the present suffering of the Irish peasantry. In the very valuable Report which had been just laid on the Table, which supplied a rich fund to draw on for future measures adapted for the improvement of Ireland, a distinguished Prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, Dr. Doyle, after coinciding with the views he had laid before the House, as to the wretched condition of the Irish peasantry, as to the ills inseparable from the subdivision and subletting of lands, and expressing his conviction that the misery of the people must, under that system, continue to increase, gave his decided approbation to the principle of the Subletting Act; but added, that it should have been accompanied by some measure to afford employment or support to the population. He felt deeply the urgent necessity of turning immediate attention to the various proposals which had been made for the employment or support of the Irish poor. From the very moment that the adjustment of that question of paramount importance—the emancipation of the Catholics—left the Irish, without distinction of sect or party, at liberty to co-operate cordially together—there had been an anxious desire to investigate the state and condition of the poorer classes in Ireland, with a view to ameliorate and relieve their present distress. No man who considered the important and extensive nature of the suggested measures would recommend a precipitate decision, or the adoption of rash or hasty legislative measures in advancing towards that from which, when once reached, no retreat remained. He would encourage the fullest investigation of the merits of all the various measures which had been suggested; but, without undervaluing them, he might be permitted to say, that he looked with great confidence for an amelioration of the condition of the Irish peasantry to the feeling and the disposition which had grown up among the Irish landlords. They had no longer contented themselves with calling on the Government and the Legislature to correct ills which were peculiarly within their own power; they no longer resembled the waggoner whose wheel stuck fast in the rut, and who called on Hercules to extricate it; but aware of the answer which he received, they had altogether put their own shoulders to the wheel, and from their exertions he confidently anticipated an amelioration in the condition of the Irish peasantry. They would, he was persuaded, knit and strengthen those ties which had for a time unfortunately been broken—they would perfect that graduated scale which, in these countries, ought to exist in close and continued contact, from the highest to the lowest, and they would accomplish this, not merely by raising the tenant to meet the landlord, but, when it might be necessary to do so, by the landlord coming down to meet the tenant. In conclusion, he would venture to implore the hon. and learned Member to reconsider this Statute,—to reflect how erroneously the dispossessing of any part of the tenantry had been attributed to it,—to remember that it was introduced into this

House, and supported by some of the best and ablest friends of Ireland, and to believe that it was eminently calculated for the protection and improvement of the Irish peasant. If the result of further consideration should lead the hon. and learned Member to concur in this view of it, he hoped that he would promulgate his altered opinion; by doing so, he would confer a greater benefit on his country than he could ever hope to be able to achieve for it by other means.

Mr. *Villiers Stewart* recommended a medium course on this occasion. The law required amendment, but he was against its total repeal. He approved of its principle but some of its details required revision. He conceived that much of the excitement that prevailed in Ireland would be allayed, if this law were not to operate upon leases made prior to its enactment; and it appeared to him, that it was better that the landlord should suffer from the imperfect wording of the old law, than that the tenant should suffer from the *ex post facto* operation of a new law. So far he agreed with the hon. and learned member for Waterford; he wished also to add, that all lands and tenements situated in towns, ought to be exempted from the operation of the Act. That part of the Act which related to devises should undoubtedly be repealed, and if these points were attended to, he conceived there would be no further objection to which the law could be justly obnoxious. In principle, this Act was perfectly equitable both as regarded landlord and tenant. In the Act itself, he saw little grounds for the clamour which had been raised against it. It had been described as an act to facilitate the depopulation of Irish estates, a character it by no means deserved. It warned the tenant that he should receive no benefit from the infringement of his contracts, and it did nothing more than enforce the observance of contracts on both the landlord and tenant. The landlord always had a right to eject his tenant if he thought fit, and the alteration made in the law by this Act was beneficial not injurious to the tenant. It certainly prevented subletting, but that was very beneficial, and he had seen many instances of great advantages resulting from the occupier holding directly of the owner of the soil. The system of infinite and complicated distresses in Ireland, arising out of the subdivision of lands, had been productive of misery, injustice, and outrage, and yet they were called upon to-night to repeal an Act which was framed to put an end to the recurrence of such monstrous evils. If the Subletting Act afforded to the landlords security against fraud; on the part of the tenants, it afforded to the tenants a defence against injustice and extortion.

Colonel *Beresford* observed, that the principle of this Act was the protection of the landlord against the frauds of his tenantry, and in his opinion no one had a right to interfere with a landlord in the distribution of his property. This Act enabled landlords to deal with their land, in a manner most advantageous for all parties. He maintained, that the great misery of the tenants was occasioned by the middle-men, who threw all the blame of their own fault on the landlords. He must beg leave of the House to take that opportunity of defending his noble relative (Lord Beresford) and his agent, from the attacks made upon them out of doors by the learned Member opposite.

Mr. *O'Connell* rose and said, that he could not well agree to the hon. Gentleman's replying to what he had said out of doors, unless he was to be allowed to satisfy the House of the authority upon which he had made his statement.

Colonel *Beresford* said, that he could not yield to the learned Gentleman's proposition, and must beg leave of the House to proceed in his statement. [Here the hon. Member read several observations that had been made upon the agent of Lord Beresford by Mr. O'Connell. The substance of them was, that Lord Beresford and his agent had hunted poor people out of their tenements, and had turned their 'holdings' into pasture lands for four-footed animals, to be shipped to England to support his Lordship in greater luxury whilst he was an absentee.] He (Colonel Beresford) had authority to deny every particle of that charge. What Lord Beresford's agent had done had been at his own loss. He had let the lands to tenants without distinction of religious or political opinions. His farms averaged from forty to sixty acres each. Dr. Doyle had borne testimony to the good conduct of this agent; and he could say, that there was not a tenant about to leave the estate who was not two years' rent in arrear.

Mr. *A. Dawson*, in reply to the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, must remind the House that the Subletting Act had nothing whatever to do with tenants at the termination of their leases. The evils which it was pretended that the Subletting Act removed could be remedied much better by other means, and particularly by the vigilance and care of landlords. The conduct of landlords, however, was not of any consequence to that House, and it was a breach of all principle for the Legislature to interpose a law between landlords and tenants, and to affect their contracts, unless the case were pointed out by public utility. The less the Legislature interfered between landlord and tenant the better. No necessity for such an interferrence existed, for the wretchedness of the people had no necessary connexion with the subletting of land. It arose from other causes. During the war the barrel of wheat which now sold for 30*s*. had sold for 5*l*., and consequently there had been a very great competition for land, which had been let and sublet through many hands. The fall of prices had ruined this latter class of persons, and not the subletting, which was generally the result more of family arrangements and exigencies than of trading in leases. If a farmer's children married, it was natural that he should let them have a portion of the land he held on a beneficial lease. But at all events it was a most glaring violation of principle to pass such a law for Ireland, and not for England. This was dissimilating the laws of the two countries, and the population driven from Ireland by the Subletting Act would naturally come over to England: they would not stop in Ireland to perish. It was not, however, to the policy or impolicy of the law that he would direct his opposition, for he objected to it entirely upon principle. He would remind Gentlemen of what the poet had said upon the subject of the poor man's occupation of land—

> "A time there was ere England's griefs began,
> When every rood of ground maintained its man."

In his opinion, if every man was put upon his rood of land, no person would be miserable.

The *Solicitor General* thought that, standing in his situation, it might be desirable for him to express his sentiments on this law, and in doing so, he could assure the House that he had no other wish than to assimilate, as much as possible, the laws of property in the two countries. It was well known that he had never spared any toil or trouble in his efforts to extend the beneficial laws of England to Ireland. He might advert to one proof—his extension of the Contempt Act to Ireland. He always had felt, and he now entertained the same favourable feelings towards every measure that could tend to the benefiting of Ireland. The hon. and learned member for Waterford must be convinced, even from the full attendance of Members on this occasion, that the House participated in these feelings; and if that hon. Member could make out that the law in its present state really oppressed Ireland, he would be one of the first to exert himself in modifying or changing it. The law appeared to depend upon its general principle, and upon its particular provisions. The learned member for Waterford had taken this arrangement in discussing the measure. In addressing himself to the principal provisions of the law, he had omitted, though he well knew the fact, that it was not, and never had been, the intention of Government to continue the provisions of the law as they now stood. Ministers were desirous of softening the provisions of the law, and to adapt them to those exigencies which could alone justify the continuance of the law at all. He would acknowledge that Government was responsible for continuing the law and that they ought to repeal it if it pressed upon the Irish people. The law, he thought, was founded upon public utility, and nothing but public utility would make him maintain a law which introduced an anomaly into the system of the two countries. But still he must deny that this had ever been a Government measure. The Bill had been proposed and framed by gentlemen of Ireland, who had as much the interest of their country at heart as the hon. and learned member for Waterford; for, whatever were the high pretensions and merits of that hon. Member, he could not possibly wish to be thought of more integrity or benevolence, or to have a greater love towards his country, than those gentlemen of Ireland who had thought, and still did think, well of this law. He (the Solicitor General) always found himself in opposition to the learned member for Waterford, but yet he had never entered into any discussions with him under the influence of personal feelings; and after what had occurred that evening he hoped to witness no more personalities; they would be totally unjustifiable unless new provocations were given, and if provocations were given, he trusted that the House would strongly express its feelings against either party using them. The principle of the Bill was, to prevent the introducing of tenants new to the landlord, and in opposition to his interests, and to the meaning of the lease he had given. He declared he was utterly incapable of conceiving how any question on the words of this law could have arisen, or how it could have the operation assigned to it by the hon. and learned member for Waterford. In the first part of that hon. Gentleman's speech he had said, that the law caused the evils he complained of; but it was utterly impossible that the law should cause any evils of the sort. The law could not turn any man out of that in which he had been in possession when the law was passed. The hon. and learned Member had asked, if persons were removed from an estate, or turned out of possession, where were they to go to? This was a question of a different nature, but there could be no difficulty in answering it. If the Church property, and property held for ninety-nine years, bore such a large proportion to the land of Ireland as the hon. Member asserted, let the people go there. The hon. and learned Member had stated that the first clause of the Act had been construed to have an *ex post facto* effect. His opinion was totally different on the subject. It had not an *ex post facto* effect, as all waivers were spoken of as prospective. This was the intention of the Legislature, and the Act had been introduced for this purpose. If there were any ambiguity upon this point, the Government would remove it. Upon the next clause the learned Gentleman had said that a future release would not enable the tenant to alienate, unless the lease expressly gave the power to do so. If this were the case, it was obvious that the effect of the law was only to put the Irish tenant on his guard, and to make him careful to stipulate for the power to sublet. Next the learned Gentleman had said, that the Legislature had taken it out of the power of the landlord to give his consent. It had done no such thing. But the landlord could not distrain if he gave his consent. It ought to be known to all England and Ireland, that this part of the law was one of the greatest boons ever given to a tenantry. If the tenant paid the rent, neither the immediate nor the superior landlord could distrain, and this removed the evil of the middle men. The hon. and learned member for Waterford, appeared to complain, that the expense by which a landlord could eject a tenant, had been reduced by the Subletting Act from 17*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* to 1*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*, and that the process of dispossession was in this manner rendered more easy to the landlord. But had not landlords rights to be protected as well as tenants? and did the hon. and learned Gentleman wish to enable the latter to set the former at defiance? If the hon. and learned Gentleman were to run the landlord's expense of ejectment up to a large sum—be it 17*l.* or 70*l.* or 700*l.* or 7,000*l.*—then the landlord's remedy would be destroyed—in point of fact, the tenant would become the landlord, his protection against dispossession being rendered complete. How inconsistent was the hon. and learned Gentleman, who professed a wish to afford cheap law in England at the door of every man's cottage, but was at the same time adverse to the extension of the same principle in Ireland to the landlord. It was the hon. and learned Member who wished for unequal law, and it was he (the Solicitor General) who was friendly to equal laws. Although he would not consent to abandon the right of the landlord, yet would he not sacrifice the poorest and humblest tenant to the most powerful landlord in the country. Equal law, equally administered to rich and poor, was what he wished to promote. Let the poor know that the law was alike accessible to all—that they had rights as well ascertained as those of the greatest landlords—that there would be a fair distribution of privileges among the different classes of society;—let this be the case and let it be universally known, and he felt certain that much dissatisfaction would be removed.

Mr. *Grattan* complained, that the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down, so far from proposing any Amendment of the Subletting Act, had denominated that measure a boon to the Irish peasantry. He (Mr. Grattan) did not contemplate it in that light, and if the question came to a division (which he rather deprecated), he should certainly support the motion of the hon. and learned member for Waterford. Without going the length of condemning the act *in toto*, he must be allowed to assert that it required amendment. He believed such to be the conviction of all who had impartially watched its operation. Earl Fitzwilliam's agent in Wicklow, Mr. Challoner (a gentleman, by the way, who had never turned two tenants off his Lordship's estates), told him (Mr. Grattan) that great difficulties had been experienced under the act, and his own experience fully justified the statement The question was, could a landlord let a farm to a middle-man under this act, and oblige him to turn out the under-tenants—or could he let it to the middle-man, with liberty to sub-let, depriving himself of all remedy against the sub-tenants? Here was one of the main difficulties of the case. He believed that a recurrence to high prices would again produce sub-letting, which the bill was framed to prevent. Since 1823, however, in consequence of the fall of prices, it had been the object of landlords to weed out the sub-tenants from their farms, and he thought it was injudicious to pass an act in 1826, the act in question, which accelerated and aggravated the operation. The disfranchisement of the 40*s*. freeholders had been attended with similar consequences. That strengthened the motives which landlords had for diminishing the number of their tenants, and had deprived a vast portion of the population of subsistence. He was for taking away from the middle-man the power of distress, and would let that power rest in the hands of the head landlord, a course which he considered preferable to that authorized by the present law. In conclusion, the hon. Gentleman expressed his anxious desire that the subject should be set at rest, and the defects of the existing system as far as possible remedied by an amended bill.

Lord *F. L. Gower* thought that it was hardly proper on the present occasion to enter into the details of the bill, for if the House should determine with the hon. member for Waterford against the principle of the measure, it would be unnecessary to discuss the details; and if the House should decide differently, the proper time for discussing them would be when a measure similar to that he had introduced last year, should be introduced by his right hon. and gallant colleague, the present Secretary for Ireland. The reason why he had proposed to amend the bill last Session was to be found in the existence of doubts and ambiguity as to the meaning and effect of the existing law. These doubts he had attempted to remove by a measure which he believed his right hon. colleague intended shortly to revive. One object of any law like the present should be, to enable landlords and tenants mutually to make contracts and enforce them, and no object could be more important. Of course, if the act failed in accomplishing this object, it was useless. He thought there was one evil attaching to the act for which none of them were answerable—the act had been passed fifty years too late; and while, by the lapse of time, it had become more wanted, it, unfortunately, was less efficacious.

Sir *H. Hardinge* begged leave to state, that it was his intention to-morrow to move for leave to bring in a bill to explain and amend the statute 7 Geo. 4. c. 29., commonly called the sub-letting act. His measure would resemble, as nearly as possible, the bill introduced by his hon. friend (Lord F. L. Gower) last year. A question had been raised as to whether if a lease did not contain a contract against sub-letting the tenant should be supposed to have violated his agreement by under-letting, a part of his holding. As the law stood, if the tenant under-let, even although there was no clause in his lease against sub-letting, he was held to have violated his contract. This was the case in Ireland, but it was not the law in England. Was it fair that such a distinction should exist? Generally speaking, a tenant was less instructed than his landlord, who had more power and information to enforce his wishes, and should specify them. It would be for the House to remedy the defect in the existing law if it should think proper. It would be extremely desirable that individuals ejected by the present law should be enabled to find employment and subsistence elsewhere, and not be encouraged to flock into towns, where they presented objects of distress and misery. It was possible when the result of the committee on the state of the poor in Ireland came before the House, that means might be discovered of employing the industrious classes, or affording relief by emigration and other measures. The hon. member for Waterford was in the habit when in Ireland of attributing all the evils that afflicted the country to the sub-letting act. He was glad that the hon. Member did not attempt to press the point in that manner in the House. If he had he could have been immediately refuted. In the report of the committee of which the hon. member for Limerick was chairman, to inquire into the propriety of giving poor-laws to Ireland, it was distinctly stated by Dr. Doyle and others, that it was not to the sub-letting act that the miseries of the peasantry were to be attributed. He would beg leave to quote a brief passage of the report: "After the peace, the great decline of agricultural produce prevented many of the middle-men from paying their rents, and a general impression was produced in the minds of all persons that a pauper population spread over the country would go on increasing, and the value of the land, at the same time, diminishing, till the produce would become insufficient to maintain the resident population. The evils became so obvious," continues Dr. Doyle, "that the proprietors thought some remedy ought to be applied; and they did accordingly apply remedies, of the principle of which I highly approve." For his own part he was of opinion that the principle of the sub-letting act was a most useful one for Ireland. The difficulty was, what to do with the individuals who might be ousted under the act. For this difficulty he trusted a remedy might be provided. It afforded him great pleasure to be able to say, that Ireland was in a state of improvement—that commerce and steam navigation were gradually operating to ameliorate the condition of the people, who were better clad than formerly—that more wheaten bread was consumed—and that crime had diminished. There was the best evidence to show, that Ireland was in a progressive state—indeed, that she was advancing faster than Scotland, or even England at former periods. With respect to the motion of the hon. member for Waterford, (to which he could not of course assent), he entertained no doubt that many of his objections would be obviated in the committee upon the bill, which he should ask leave to introduce to-morrow.

Mr. *Wyse* had heard with pleasure the intention expressed by the right hon. and gallant Secretary to introduce a measure for the amendment of an act which, whatever were its merits, or demerits, had produced a vast deal of dissatisfaction in Ireland. He would not go into the legal question involved in the bill, but as a representative of an Irish county, and being sensible how much the sub-letting act affected the agricultural population of Ireland, he felt, that he should be guilty of a dereliction of his duty if he did not express his opinion on the subject. The whole of the discussion appeared to be simply this—whether the old bill should be amended as proposed by the right hon. Secretary, or whether it should be thrown aside and a new bill substituted, in accordance with the motion of the hon. member for Waterford. As he was for simplicity in legislation, he felt disposed to follow the second plan. It having been assumed or ascertained that great inconvenience was experienced in Ireland from the minute sub-division of land, the sub-letting act was adopted—a bill which could not be carried into effect without the expulsion of a part of the population from their holdings. Sure he was, that the measure was not adopted, as had been injudiciously and falsely said, for the purpose of giving power to one class of citizens over another, not to arm landlords against tenants; the Legislature had in view to check the growth of the superabundant population of the country—superabundant in reference to the resources of the State that were brought into action. The question with every good government was, how best to raise the amount of capital in due proportion with the amount of population; and if a government were wise and powerful, and identified with the interests of the people, it would not be long till it discovered the means of effecting this object: but if a government were imbecile, dishonest, and disposed to palter with the happiness of the nation, it would more easily find means to reduce population to the level of capital than, to raise the latter in proportion to the growth of population. He did not say that such was the object of the sub-letting act. The object of that act was to prevent the minute sub-division of land. Now he was not one of those who praised small or large farms abstractedly considered: the advantage of small or large farms depended upon various considerations. The present law saw in the middle-man principally the cause of all the disasters of Ireland. But the middle-man was not always mischievous. Ireland was at one period in a situation to require middle-men. She was in the situation of a conquered country, with absentee proprietors, and gladly availed herself of a class of men to take their places. The middle-man of that day constituted the only link between the two orders of the

State—almost the only link between the two countries. But another class of middle-men was generated by the high war-price of corn, and the result was too great a division of land in Ireland, and too high a price for land. When the war ceased, prices fell, and the alteration from a state of war with high prices, to a state of peace with low prices, was accompanied by great inconveniences. A similar effect was produced in Scotland after the Union, according to Fletcher of Saltoun, in England in the reigns of James and Elizabeth, and might be now observed in Westphalia. He did not maintain that the sub-letting act had produced all the evil, but he was of opinion that it had caused a considerable part of it, especially as no reservoir was provided for the people ejected in consequence of it. The evil, however occasioned, still stared the Legislature in the face, and would continue to do so till some effectual means of amelioration were adopted. He strongly recommended the right hon. and gallant Secretary not to bring in the bill of which he had given notice unaccompanied by some of the other great measures of amelioration to which he had alluded. As to emigration, he did not approve of it as a remedial measure. He did not like to send away a portion of our population which, judiciously treated at home, might add to instead of diminishing our resources. He did not like to dismiss them to some distant colony, where they might eventually turn and sting us, as was the case with America, He disapproved of sending away the flower of our population—the muscle and mind of the whole—leaving behind the lees and dregs of the lower orders of the community. If asked for his remedial measures, he answered, he would remove the impediments of commerce—for instance, he would set free the coal trade, he would break down all monopolies, whether of grand juries or corporations, which would give an impulse to industry and enterprise, and that he would enforce by loans and other salutary means.

Sir *J. Bourke* thought that the Subletting Act tended to prevent the improvement of waste lands in Ireland; because in cases where large portions of bog and other waste land were held by an individual, the immediate tenant was restricted from underletting parts of those wastes to persons who, if they could obtain possession of them in moderate quantities, would undertake to reclaim them. He therefore thought the present Act injurious in its effects, however good were the intentions of its framers. He should be happy to give his assistance to the right hon. Secretary for Ireland in his endeavours to amend the bill, provided the motion of the hon. and learned member for Waterford were lost, though, in the first instance, he should certainly vote for that.

Lord *Boyle* said, he should vote against the motion of the hon. member for Waterford, not that he approved of the Subletting Act, which, he must say, was very unpopular in Ireland, but because, after the statement of the right hon. Secretary, he thought it his duty to wait for the amended bill.

Mr. *Ruthven* expressed his satisfaction at what had been said by the Secretary for Ireland, of his intention to introduce a bill to amend this Act, which had already produced so much mischief; but, at the same time as he highly disapproved of the Subletting Act, which was a restriction both on landlords and tenants, he would vote for the motion of the hon. member for Waterford.

Mr. *O'Connell*, in reply, said, that in the speech to which the hon. Member (Colonel Beresford) referred, he had not used the words attributed to him. The speech was taken by the reporters, who attended in the open air, and without any accommodations, hence it was very inaccurately given. He had said nothing whatever which he was not prepared by documents to prove. With respect to the Motion before the House, one thing at least would give satisfaction to the people of Ireland; namely, the very patient attention with which it was discussed by the House. Another source of satisfaction to them would be found in the professions of hon. Members, of good dispositions to that country. He feared, however, that many of them would be found to be only professions. The rejection of his Motion would, on the other hand, produce great dissatisfaction, as the feeling was universal in the country against the Subletting Act. The hon. and learned Solicitor General, in opposing this Motion, had said, that the time was not yet arrived in Ireland when the occupiers of the soil were to become the masters of its owners. It was true it was not, and not likely to be; but in England something like this seemed not far distant, for in some counties, not far from London, some of the labourers seemed to be disposed to dictate to the land-owners the rates at which they ought to hold their lands. The hon. and learned Member concluded by saying, that whatever might be the fate of his Motion, he had the satisfaction of having done his duty.

The House divided—For the Motion 24; Against it 150—Majority 126.

List of the Minority.

Brabazon, Lord
Brown, Hon. Wm.
Bourke, Sir J.
Bunbury, Sir Henry E.
Dawson, Alex.
Denman, Thos.
Fitzgibbon, Colonel
Grattan, James
Howard, Ralph
Howard, Philip
Hodgson, John
Jephson, C. D. O.
Johnson, Jas.
Killeen, Lord
Leader, N. P.
Lambert, J. S.
Macnamara, Major
Osborne, Lord Fran.
O'Brien, W. S.
O'Tarrell, Moor
O'Connor, Don
O'Grady, Colonel
Ruthven, E. S.
Wyse, Thos.

TELLERS.

Hume, Joseph
O'Connell, Daniel

STATE OF THE POORER CLASSES (IRELAND.)] Mr. *Spring Rice* moved "That a Select Committee be appointed to take into consideration the state of the Poorer Classes in Ireland, and the best means of improving their condition; and to report their observations thereon to the House." The hon. Member explained, that his object was, to revive the Committee which sat last Session, adding a few Members and filling up the places of those who were no longer in Parliament.

Mr. *Grattan* rose, to move an Amendment to the Motion of his hon. friend. He admitted that the names of the Gentlemen selected were most respectable, but they were, unfortunately, Gentlemen who had strong opinions against the measure of giving relief to Ireland by any system of Poor-laws. Of all the Members of the Committee, there were only ten or eleven favourable to such a measure. This might be inferred from the fact, that in the last Report, which extended to fifty-seven pages, and which, with the Appendix of evidence, occupied four large volumes, there were only sixteen lines which referred to that measure of relief. The Members of the Committee reminded him of the company of actors who undertook to perform the play of the Prince of Denmark, leaving out the part of Hamlet. Here was a committee appointed for the purpose of considering the state of the Irish poor; and they omitted to take any notice of the only measure by which relief could be effectually and permanently given. He could not consent to a repetition of such a course as that. If committees were to be appointed, let them be composed not entirely of men who had formed and expressed strong opinions on one side of any subject under consideration. The Committee should, at least, be so composed that the investigation would have a chance of being conducted with impartiality and without prejudice. He could not consent to his hon. friend bringing in eighteen or nineteen Irish bills (though, by the way, only two of them were new) from which no practical good could result. Committees had gone on inquiring to an immense extent, and had produced no practical advantage. Much had been said of the state of Ireland, and of the distress existing there, and a vast mass of information on the subject was contained in the volumes already laid on the Table, and yet no effectual measure was proposed. He would rather go without any inquiry at all than inquire without any useful result. The system of committees only tended to delay practical measures. In the last ten years there had been ten committees appointed, which had made reports so voluminous that very few Gentlemen could read them; and now the House was told, that before anything could be done, it must inquire more; it must wait until this committee and the other committee had made their Report. Such a mode of doing business was only wasting time in hearing evidence, and drawing reports, and wasting the public money in having them printed. Then, upon the question of Irish Grand Juries, how long were committees of the House engaged? They sat till the weather became too hot for meeting; and then only one bill was brought in, to regulate one subject, which did not embrace a tithe of the business brought under the consideration of the Committee. Three committees on the employment of the poor had sat also in 1824 and 1825, which published very voluminous reports, and what more would the House want? In fact, the subject had been threshed and rethreshed; and a similar committee had sat in 1826 and 1827. For any practical measure the House already possessed quite sufficient evidence. It was only a waste of the public money, and agitating the subject without any necessity. His hon. friend had got fifty witnesses over from Ireland, and the Reverend Doctor Doyle was one of them; but the evidence of that Gentleman would hardly tally with the views of his hon. friend. He also objected to the manner in which part of the evidence was obtained. He did not like opinions to be elicited by long cross-examination; but wished each witness to state his conviction in his own plain way. He said this, because he had seen a letter some time ago in one of the Irish papers, from a Mr. Jameson, who complained of the usage he received from a committee before which he was examined. Such conduct was to be deprecated, because it looked as if hon. Members were not seeking to come at the truth, but to elicit particular opinions in support of particular theories. He repeated, that the House had before it sufficient evidence to warrant it in proceeding with some legislative measure for the relief of the labouring poor of Ireland, without further delay, or further inquiry by committees, which would end in nothing. The Reports of the Committee would probably be as little to the purpose as the last, in which, out of fifty-seven pages, only sixteen lines were devoted to the subject most deeply connected with the inquiry. The Report gave the House information on a matter well known since the days of Elizabeth, which had been before the public for upwards of two centuries, viz. that the system of the Poor-laws was very good if wisely administered. It was, no doubt, very kind of the Committee to tell the House that it was a waste of time for the Committee to have so occupied themselves. The Book on Ireland, written by the hon. member for Newark, contained more valuable information respecting the state of that country than all the reports that had ever been laid on the Table of the House. He was satisfied, if that hon. Member had been in the House, he would have seconded the Amendment which he begged to propose to the Motion of his hon. friend. The hon. Member moved accordingly, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the question, in order to add the words, "the state and the condition of the poor of Ireland have been laid before this House, from time to time, by reports of various committees and commissions; that during the last twelve years, not less than ten reports from committees, and ten from commissions, and, with them, a great mass of evidence, have been laid on the Table of this House; that it is therefore our opinion that sufficient evidence has been obtained and presented to enable this House to legislate on this subject, and that it is expedient that some legislative measure should be forthwith adopted for the employment and relief of the poor of Ireland."

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* said, that it was not from any feeling of indifference to the situation of Ireland, or to the welfare of its people, that he stated that he was completely tired out with hearing hon. Members from that country continually moving for committees, and complaining of the distress prevalent there. He would suggest, that it would be infinitely better if hon. Members would bring forward specific motions, instead of night after night occupying the House with debates, and then moving for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire. He agreed with the observations which fell from the hon. member for Wicklow, respecting the inefficacy of all inquiries before committees. He did not intend to oppose the motion of the hon. member for Limerick, for he entertained no objection to appointing a committee, provided he had not to serve upon it; but he was convinced, not only from the reports of a number of committees appointed to inquire into the state of Ireland, but also by reports on various subjects, that it was folly to expect that any good could result from the labours of a Select Committee. He never remembered any good practical measure which had originated in a committee. It ought to be the business of Government to take up a grievance and apply a remedy, for it must necessarily have better opportunities than any committee to get information. Suppose a committee to agree in a report, and recommend the enactment of some measure to Parliament, it could not be carried into effect unless it met with the approbation and support of Government. With regard to the observations which had been made respecting the distress in the two countries, he could only say, that the distress and the evils of both countries arose from the same source, and the same measure of relief might efficaciously be applied to both. He called upon Ministers to reduce our enormous establishments, and to effect savings to such an extent, that the people might be relieved from the load of taxation which now pressed them to the earth. It had been stated, that Ireland was over-peopled; that the inhabitants were, in consequence, in a most wretched condition; and that they came to England, reducing, by the competition of Irish and English labour in the market, our peasantry to the same miserable situation as that in which they were placed. The persons who made this statement forgot that nearly all the produce of Ireland was brought to the English market, and that the people, as a matter of course followed it. He heard, a few evenings ago, an hon. Member declare, that all the commodities produced there were brought to the English market. Another hon. Member, only a night or two ago, complained that the Irish pigs were brought into the English market in such numbers that it materially injured the English farmer in the West of England. It had been stated, that there were four million acres of waste land in Ireland, capable of being cultivated. If there be a surplus population in that country, distribute that land amongst the people, and we shall then prevent the influx of the Irish labourers into England, which is so much exclaimed against. Again, let them keep and eat their own pigs and cattle, and then we should hear no more complaints from the English farmer on the subject. That appeared to him a very simple remedy for an evil which so much alarmed some hon. Members. All the misery and distress of the people arose from the bad constitution of the Legislature, and from the gross abuses existing in the Government. There had been report upon report, and committee upon committee on the state of Ireland, and what good had resulted from all their labours? He did not wish to call the attention of the House or the Government to the condition of Ireland in particular, but generally to that of the country, in which the distress was really alarming. The evils which existed in Ireland also existed to nearly the same extent in England; and the grounds for inquiry were, therefore, as strong in the one case as in the other. If any one had an intention to move for a committee to inquire into the origin of the distresses of both countries, with a view to get at a remedy, he should not oppose the Motion, although he did not think a Select Committee a very convenient instrument for getting at truth. It was the duty of Ministers to point out remedies for the evils, both of Ireland and England; and if they were not able to do so, they ought to resign their places. At present, one Member got up one night to move for a committee to inquire into one subject; and the next night another Member moved for a committee on some other subject, and no good was ever attained. Sending a measure to a committee was sending it to its grave, and though he had no wish to oppose the hon. Member, he was inclined to object to his Motion.

Mr. *Brownlow*, could not help expressing his surprise at the observations of the hon. member for Wicklow, and at the Amendment he had proposed. In the former discussion of this evening the hon. Member expressed himself in favour of the principle of the Subletting Act, and immediately afterwards voted for the repeal of it. If the hon. Member was favourable to that measure, why turn round, immediately after his declaration in behalf of it, and vote against it? The hon. Member now says, that he cannot see what benefit can possibly result from the labours of a committee, on a subject like the present. He has also stated, that he laments the situation of those who have been turned out of their homes through the operation of the Subletting Act; he has urged, that a number of miserable creatures will be scattered over the surface of the land, without any one knowing what is to become of them; for the purpose of solving that question, his hon. friend, the member for Limerick, moved for the present committee; and he, therefore, was much surprised that the hon. Member should oppose the Motion. The hon. Member stated, that the subject had been repeatedly inquired into before committees, and always without any useful result. But that was not the case. The objection which he urged against the members of the Committee, being most of them unfavourable to the introduction of a system of Poor-laws into Ireland, was without foundation. He was himself favourable to the introduction of a modified system of Poor-laws into that country; therefore desirous that the subject should be examined before the Committee; but during the last Session of Parliament, the time of the Committee was occupied with other subjects, and it was understood that a motion should be made for its re-appointment this Session, with a view to continue the investigations on this subject. He could not resume his seat without alluding to the charge brought against his hon. friend, the Chairman of that Committee, of going into the inquiry with a view of supporting one side of the question. He was satisfied that every member of that committee would bear testimony to the impartiality, the judgment, and the attention which that hon. Member displayed, and to his great industry and zeal in furtherance of the object of inquiry.

Mr. *Phillip H. Howard* wished to state, in a very few words, his reason for supporting a modified system of Poor-laws for Ireland, which, he conceived, would be attended with great benefit to both countries. He was satisfied, that the feeling of the large county which he had the honour to represent was favourable to the introduction of such a system, and he believed that such a feeling was becoming general. He knew that a very strong wish was manifested by English farmers for such a measure. It was a matter of general complaint, that the expense of maintaining the Irish pauper population fell, not upon the Irish aristocracy and landlords, but upon the middle classes of this country, who were so reduced that they were struggling for existence. The English labourer, also, was daily descending lower in the scale, and his condition was materially deteriorated by the great competition in the labour-market. The circumstances of the English labourer had been reduced by the great influx of the Irish peasantry, and the misery which prevailed in Ireland was spreading rapidly here. The condition of the Irish peasantry would have been infinitely better had there been a system of Poor-laws in that country; and some provision for the poor of Ireland was now necessary for the welfare of both countries. A tax for the support of the Irish poor was the only tax which could be imposed on the absentees of that country, compatible with the institutions of a free country, and he should like to see such a tax levied as would reach the great estates of absentee proprietors. Such a tax would operate as a protection to the rate-payers in England, and would greatly improve the condition and character of the Irish peasantry.

Mr. *O'Brien* did not desire to disparage the labours of the Committee of last Session, on the subject of the Irish poor, but he could not find that any useful measure had resulted from its labours. The Committee was occupied in examinations which appeared to him to have nothing to do with the object of inquiry. With respect to the question of the Poor-laws, he should be loth to trust to the Report of any committee on a matter of such vital importance, and still less to one constituted as the late one was. What could be expected from a committee from which the hon. member for Wicklow and the hon. member for Newark were carefully excluded? If, therefore, the Committee was re-appointed, he should propose that the names of those two hon. members and that of the hon. member for Banbury, be added.

Mr. *Vernon Smith* could not neglect the opportunity of paying his tribute of respect to the Chairman of the Committee for the industry, judgment, and impartiality which he had exhibited on all occasions. He needed no other proof of this than the Report on the Table, which was a sufficient evidence of these virtues. With respect to the Poor-laws, the Committee postponed its labours on that point, because it had not sufficient evidence to form a determination, and it resolved to apply to the House for permission to resume the inquiry. As for the charge that the Chairman was prejudiced against the introduction of Poor-laws, he did not believe it, and in the Report which he drew up there were only eleven lines on the subject, which merely recommend that it should be made a future subject of inquiry. He knew that some persons entertained strong prejudices against the introduction of Poor-laws into Ireland, in consequence of conceiving that it was meant to adopt the English system. That was not the case; no human being would ever think of recommending an anomalous system like the present Poor-laws of this country. Before, however, any step could be taken, it was necessary to get every information on the subject; and there was no better way than by the inquiries of a Committee. He was exceedingly surprised to hear an hon. Member assert, that the Reports on Ireland were little better than waste paper, and that it was a useless expenditure of the public money to print them. He could only say, that he wished the public money might never be spent in a less useful manner. He entered into the Committee with a prejudice in favour of Poor-laws for Ireland; but that prejudice was now much weakened; for, amongst all the numerous witnesses examined by the Committee, there was not one who had a feasible plan for carrying that object into effect. The hon. member for Wicklow was incorrect in asserting that it had been determined, beforehand, not to recommend a system of Poor-laws. Only two plans for the introduction of Poor-rates into Ireland were presented to the Committee—the first was drawn up by Dr. Doyle, and the other by Colonel Page. On inquiry, Dr. Doyle admitted that he was entirely unacquainted with the English system; and Colonel Page admitted that the whole period of his residence in Ireland did not exceed three months. The House, therefore, would not be surprised to hear that neither of those plans met with the approbation of the Committee. If the hon. member for Wicklow had seen the care and attention manifested by the hon. member for Limerick, he would not have charged him with partiality as Chairman of the Committee. No doubt, he put more questions than any other Member, in consequence of the situation which he filled; but in all of them he manifested nothing but a disposition to find out and support truth.

Mr. *Spring Rice* meant to confine himself to replying to some of the observations of his hon. friend the member for Wicklow. On bringing this subject forward last year, he entered into a long statement of the motives which induced him to submit it to the consideration of Parliament; and did not, therefore, make any remarks on the present occasion. The hon. Member complained of his silence, but that was dictated by supposing that there would be no objection to the motion. He was less surprised at the complaints, when he heard the hon. Member charge the Committee with being prejudiced on the subject. The hon. member for Wicklow seemed to think that the only matter for inquiry before the Committee was the Poor-laws, and that he (Mr. Rice) was strongly prejudiced against them. But he would appeal to any Gentleman who heard him—to the right hon. Gentleman opposite, who was in the House at the time,—whether he did not distinctly state, on bringing the subject before Parliament last year, that the question of the introduction of the Poor-laws into Ireland was one that required investigation; acknowledging certainly that, from the best attention he could give the subject, it appeared to him that the introduction of Poor-laws into Ireland would not be beneficial to that country. But as this was a subject which had been recommended as a remedy for the evils of Ireland, the Committee appointed to find out practical remedies should embrace it as one of the topics of its investigation. The hon. Member insinuated, that he had proposed a committee with a view of preventing the introduction of Poor-laws into Ireland; because, when he moved for the appointment of the Committee, he had expressed an opinion unfavourable to those laws. The hon. Gentleman had also insinuated, that the inquiries were directed by the Chairman, and always had a particular leaning; but he should recollect, that although inquiry generally commences with the Chairman, it is not confined to him, and those who are friendly to the principle of the Poor-laws have the opportunity of putting questions as well as those who are not. Did the hon. Member conceive for a moment that it was in the power of any one Member to influence the opinions of a committee of the House? He would read the names of those who constituted the Committee last year, and would ask any man whether he could for one moment think that the members of it would tolerate any one person putting on an appearance of dictation? The first name was Sir John Newport, Sir Robert Peel followed, then came Lord Althorp, Lord Milton, Sir Matthew W. Ridley, Lord Ashley, Mr. Brownlow, who had previously declared himself favourable to the introduction of a system of Poor-laws as the means best calculated to improve and advance the state of the labouring classes in Ireland; and he would take that opportunity of thanking his hon. friend for the attention which he paid to the inquiry before the Committee—Mr. George Dawson, Mr. Maurice Fitzgerald, Mr. Charles Grant, Mr. Huskisson, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Lamb, Lord Palmerston, Mr. Villiers, Mr. Slaney, and other equally high and honourable men. After mentioning these names, he trusted that it would never be insinuated again that he endeavoured to pack the Committee. The hon. member for Ennis stated, that there was ground of suspicion in consequence of the exclusion of the two hon. Members from the Committee whose names he mentioned. With respect to the hon. member for Wicklow, the avowal of that hon. Member was quite sufficient to shew that he would be a very improper person to be placed on any such committee. After his declaration, that the appointment of the Committee was a mere delusion, and its last Report no better than waste paper, it would have been insulting him by asking him to take part in its labours; and after such a declaration, he should never invite him to join any committee which he might originate. With respect to the hon. member for Newark, he agreed with the hon. member for Ennis, that a committee on this subject without the hon. member for Newark, must appear incomplete. In the first instance, his name was included in the list of the Committee; and he should have been very glad if that hon. Member would have consented to lend the assistance of his valuable service in furtherance of its objects; but he declined doing so, and stated that he should be unable to attend. He could not, therefore, be charged, in this instance, with unfairness, as it was at the request of the hon. member for Newark that his name was struck out. So much, therefore, for the charge of having acted unfairly in not putting in the names of those two hon. Members. So earnest was he to get from the hon. member for Newark all the information possible, and especially on the subject of the English Poor-laws, with reference to the propriety of adopting a modified system for Ireland, that he asked him to be examined as a witness, but this also that hon. Member declined, notwithstanding he was urged more than once to consent. The hon. and gallant member for Liverpool was also invited, as he was an advocate for the introduction of Poor-laws into Ireland, to attend, and lend us the assistance of his evidence, but he also declined doing so. As a proof that the labours of the Committee were not altogether without use, he might refer to the testimony borne by several hon. Members in the course of the discussion; but it was hardly necessary, as a specific reason had been stated for the re-appointment of the Committee—it had not completed its examination on the subject of the Poor-laws. He had heard with surprise, hon. Members charge the Committee with being prejudiced against the introduction of such a system: all that the Report said was,—"The subject which has occupied the greater portion of the time of your Committee, and that on which the most prolonged examination of witnesses has taken place, is the inquiry how far the Poor-laws of England or of Scotland, the principles of the 43rd of Elizabeth, or any other system of assessment for the purpose of relief, can be introduced into Ireland with beneficial consequences. Your Committee conceive it wholly impossible to over-estimate the importance of a correct judgment on this subject; involving, as it does, if decided affirmatively, an entire change in the domestic economy of eight millions of persons. A false step may here be of such fatal consequences, that it greatly behoves the Legislature to proceed cautiously, to investigate closely, and to weigh accurately before any final decision is made. In the present state of the Session, your Committee, though fully prepared to consider this branch of the subject, are unwilling to present any specific Report, in the unavoidable absence of many of their members: they, therefore, content themselves with recommending, that the consideration of the subject may be resumed at a future time; and that, in the mean while, the most severe and scrutinizing attention may be applied to the important evidence already before the House."—The Committee, therefore, had not concluded its investigation, and it gave no opinion. If he did not move for the re-appointment of this Committee, he should be guilty of a breach of duty. He wished, however, to remark, that it was not intended that the Committee should meet more than once before Christmas; and, in the first place, he intended to propose that it should investigate the evidence already taken before proceeding to examine any new witnesses.

Amendment negatived without a division, and Committee appointed.

On the name of Mr. O'Connell being proposed, the hon. Member said, that he could not consent to be a member of the Committee, as he did not think any good could result from its appointment. There was already a fund in Ireland in the possession of the Church, from which the poor ought to be relieved.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, Nov. 12.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. For the immediate abolition of Slavery, by Lord DURHAM, from Durham, Stockton-on-Tees, and Bishop Wearmouth:—By Earl SPENCER, from Northampton, and from the Parish of Belton:—By the Marquis of BUTE, from Banbury, in Oxfordshire:—By the Marquis of ANGLESEA, from Carnarvon:—By Lord CAWDOR, from various places in South Wales:—By the Bishop of BATH and WELLS, from the

Clergy of the County of Wilts; and from Cromer and Chard:—By Lord SUFFIELD, from Norfolk:—By Lord WHARNCLIFFE, from Huddersfield, and a great number of places in the County of York:—By the Earl of OXFORD, from Suffolk. By the Marquis of ANGLESEA, from the Debtors confined in the Four Courts Marshalsea, Dublin, praying that the Bankrupt Laws and the Insolvent Debtor Laws of Ireland might be assimilated to those of England.

KILDARE-STREET SOCIETY.] The Marquis of *Anglesea* presented a Petition from the Parishes of Kilcoman and Robin, Ireland, praying an alteration of the method of distributing the funds placed by Parliament at the disposal of the Kildare-street Society in Dublin. The noble Marquis supported the prayer of the petition, and observed, that unless Government interfered, and adopted some of the suggestions which had been made to them relative to the future management of the funds of the Society, and the system of education, the object of those who wished to give education to the Irish people, would be completely frustrated. The propriety of the management of the funds of the Society had been much questioned before he left the Government of Ireland; and by a compromise between the contending parties it was agreed, that 25,000*l.* should be placed at the disposal of the Lord-lieutenant, to be by him dealt with as he thought best for the accomplishment of the intentions of Parliament. On learning the nature of the trust reposed in him, he proceeded to make inquiries respecting the state of the schools; but on referring a short time afterwards to the accounts of the expenditure of the Society, he found, to his great surprise, that of the 25,000*l.* placed at his disposal, 15,000*l.* had been already expended by the Directors of the Society in advance, and that the remaining 10,000*l.* were also devoted by them to objects in which the Lord-lieutenant had not been consulted. Under these circumstances, and looking to the dissensions which prevailed between the two religions with respect to the system of education, he thought that Parliament should pause before it gave any more money for the same purpose; and that, at all events, no further grant should be made without the most minute inquiry.

The Marquis of *Clanricarde* said, that he also had petitions to present on the same subject, and he hoped, before any money was wasted, that the matter would be thoroughly investigated. He had great hopes that abuses would speedily be checked in Ireland by the hon. and gallant Secretary, whose appointment to the office of Chief Secretary was to him a subject of congratulation.

The Marquis of *Lansdown* said, it was the opinion of almost all those who had given their attention to subjects of this nature, that no good could be produced by the grants, unless Government took the whole management and application of the funds into its own hands. If their Lordships wished to understand the full extent of the abuses of the present system, and the best method of remedying them, they could obtain much valuable information, and would receive some excellent suggestions, from the Report of the Committee of the House of Commons, which sat towards the end of the last Session to inquire into the state of the poor in Ireland.

Lord *Carbery* defended the conduct of the Kildare-street Society, and denied that the expenditure alluded to by the noble Marquis (Anglesea) was either contrary to the powers of the Society, or prejudicial to the objects which it was called on to accomplish.

The Marquis of *Downshire* also defended the Society. He had held the situation of President, and he could say with great confidence, that the intentions of its members were always pure, and that they had devoted their funds according to the best of their judgment, to promote education among the poorer classes of all religious persuasions.

The Marquis of *Anglesea* had not intended to impute anything like fraud to those who disposed of the grant to the Society. All he wished for was inquiry; because he was satisfied, that if the Society pursued the present system, and compelled the Catholic children to read the Bible, the objects of the Legislature would be continually defeated, and the money thrown away.

The Earl of *Darnley* was much in favour of religious instruction for the poor, but he had some doubts whether the grants to the Kildare-street Society really promoted that object. He was perfectly convinced of the truth of the noble Marquis's statement, but he thought the whole subject required investigation.

OUTRAGES IN KENT AND SUSSEX.] The Duke of *Richmond*, on the presentation of a Petition against Slavery, took occasion to advert to the debate which took place last night on the subject of the state of the labourers in Kent and Sussex, and begged to say a few words in explanation of what fell from him on that occasion. A noble Lord opposite (Lord Teynham) had asserted, that the farmers in the county of Sussex were compelled to raise the rate of wages, in consequence of being subjected to intimidation from their labourers. Now this assertion he had felt himself warranted in denying, at least with respect to the county of Sussex. It might have been so in other places, but in Sussex generally, he believed it was not the case. He did not then mean to say that there were not one or two places in which intimidation might have been used, but in the west of Sussex, with which he was connected, nothing of the kind had taken place, or been attempted. What he rose then, however, for was, to give the noble Lord who made the assertion an opportunity of explaining the nature of the conclusion he had drawn from the communications which he had referred to. The noble Lord had put into his hand the letter on which he founded his assertion; but he thought that if the noble Lord had attentively examined the terms of that letter, he would have come to a very different conclusion. He had nothing to do with the opinions of the writer of the letter, but he found it stated the facts thus:—"The labourers called out for an increase of their wages." It was then said to them, 'But what will you do if the farmers refuse to grant that increase? Will you disgrace yourselves and your country, as they have done elsewhere, by destroying the property of your masters, if they find they cannot make this increase?' 'No, no,' they exclaimed, 'we intend, on the contrary, to support and protect our masters' property.' 'Well, but (it was said to them) that assertion of yours is not enough; will you put that in your petition to your masters?' They said they were quite willing to do so; and the farmers, on receiving this petition, did consent to give greater wages." Now this, he contended, exhibited nothing which could be construed into intimidation. He was sorry to say, however, that no man who heard the speech of the noble Lord could avoid receiving the impression, that its expressions were calculated to inflame the minds of the people, and aggravate the difficulties in which the farmers were placed with respect to their labourers. He was one of those who thought the agricultural labourers of this country were not adequately paid for their services; but he was quite certain that no course could be adopted more prejudicial to their interests, and to the interests of their masters, than by making declarations in that House, or in the other House, which would lead the labourers to believe that their objects could be effected by intimidating their masters. It was because the people of Kent and Sussex were, unhappily, in a state of excitement, that he thought nothing should be done to widen the breach between the labourer and the farmer; for it could not be too often repeated, or too widely disseminated, that the interests of the farmer, the landlord, and the labourer, were one and the same.

Lord *Teynham* was obliged to the noble Duke for the opportunity he had given him of explaining the meaning of what had fallen from him on a former evening. It was very far from his intention to excite the people to violence. The meaning of what he said was this—that in consequence of what had happened in Sussex and elsewhere, the farmers had felt it to be right to raise the rate of wages; but he was at the same time fully prepared to admit, that it was necessary to put down every attempt at intimidation, and that the labourers must not be led to expect that they could obtain any increased rate of remuneration for their services, without the full consent of their employers. What he said on the former occasion was merely this—that the labourers had demanded a higher rate of wages, and that the farmers thought it prudent to comply.

Marquis *Camden* was happy to hear the language of the noble Duke with relation to the attempts of the labourers against their employers. He thought that such declarations on that subject would do good, and that it was highly necessary the labourers should know that any attempt at intimidation was not approved of either by the Parliament or the country at large. He hoped that the opinions of Parliament would be made known, and that it would be understood every where, that no man of either House approved of such a system Any attempt to raise the wages of the labourer under such circumstances must fail, because the amount was much greater than the farmer at present could afford to pay.

The Earl of *Darnley* said, the disturbances in Kent could not have arisen from the lowness of the rate of wages, as it was a singular fact, that the wages of labour were higher in the disturbed district than in any other place of the South. He believed the disturbances did not arise from an inadequate rate of wages, but from the superabundance of labourers, and the want of employment. Throughout that part of Kent, the wages of an able-bodied man were 2*s.* a-day; and if the farmers were disposed to give, as he understood some of them had agreed to give, 2*s.* 6*d.*, then, in his opinion, the distress would be increased; because the farmer could not afford to employ so many labourers at 2*s.* 6*d.* as he had formerly employed at 2*s.* He was afraid that much of the evil arose from the mal-administration of the Poor-laws, the abuses of which needed an effectual and speedy remedy.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, Nov. 12.

MINUTES.] The House, in a Committee of Supply, voted 3,253,328l. to make good the sum voted in the last Session of Parliament.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. GUEST, various Accounts of the quantity of Iron imported into, and exported from, the United Kingdom, in the year 1829:—On the Motion of Mr. ELLIS, of the Money paid on account of the Savings Banks, and on account of the Reduction of the National Debt, by terminable Annuities:—On the Motion of Mr. JEPHSON, the Contract Prices at Kilmainham Hospital, from the earliest period at which they could be made out:—On the Motion of Mr. SPRING RICE, the Expense incurred in taking the last Census for Ireland.

Petitions presented. From J. Ingram Lockart, complaining of the return for the City of Oxford:—From John R. Deene and Henry Shirley, complaining of the return for Winchilsea:—By Mr. H. SUMNER, from Hylton Joliffe, Esq., complaining of an undue return for the County of Surrey. By Sir J. BOURKE, from Fish Curers and other persons interested in the Fisheries in Ireland, praying for a continuance of the bounty. For the abolition of Slavery, by Mr. C. DUNDAS, two from Berkshire:—By Sir R. VYVYAN, fifty from Cornwall:—By Mr. HODGSON, from Cheltenham:—By Mr. EGERTON, from Stockport:—By Colonel DAVIES, twenty-one from Worcestershire:—By Mr. GUEST, from Devonshire:—By Mr. HODGES, from Canterbury:—By Mr. E. B. CLIVE, four from Herefordshire:—By Lord ALTHORP, twelve from Northampton, and one from the neighbourhood of Russell-square:—By Mr. SANDFORD, five from Somersetshire:—By Mr. WILKS, from Birmingham, Lancaster, and Crouch End:—By Mr. CURTEIS, three from Sussex:—By Mr. DUNDAS, two from Yorkshire:—By Sir R. PRICE, three from Herefordshire:—By Sir R. HERON, thirteen from Hampshire and other places:—By Mr. SCHONSWAR, two from Hull:—By Sir W. GUISE, five from Gloucestershire:—By Mr. BETHELL, from the West Riding of Yorkshire:—By Mr. LAWLEY, from Alcester and Stratford-upon-Avon:—By Mr. TYRRELL, three from Essex:—By Mr. JOHN WOOD, from Kirkham:—By Mr. BENETT, eight from Wiltshire. By the same hon. Member, from Hindon, for the repeal of the Malt Duties. By Mr. LEADER, from the Inhabitants of Athlone, for the Emancipation of the Jews. By Mr. O'CONNELL, from the Parish of Kilmore, in the County of Wexford, complaining of Distress, and praying for the Repeal of the Legislative Union of Great Britain and Ireland.

IRISH CORPORATION FUNDS.] Mr. *Leader* presented a Petition from the Inhabitants of Athlone, praying for an inquiry into the distribution of Corporation Funds in Ireland. The hon. Member observed, that he knew no subject which more deserved the attention of the House. In consequence of the mismanagement of the funds in question, half a million of people were in a state of utter destitution. He had ascertained that the value of 10,000*l.* a year was given by the Crown in land to the Corporation of Kilkenny, the members of which consisting of a very few individuals, actually divided it entirely among themselves.

NEWSPAPERS AND STAMP DUTIES.] Lord *Morpeth* presented a Petition from the inhabitants of Manchester, praying for the abolition, or considerable reduction of the Duty on Newspaper Stamps and Duties. At present those Stamps and Duties constituted two-thirds of the entire cost of every newspaper. The consequence was, that the newspaper press was monopolised by a few persons, who thereby acquired great power of promoting their own ends by misrepresentation. To reduce the duties would increase the Revenue, in consequence of the much greater number of newspapers that it would cause to be circulated; and at the same time it would give increased employment to paper-makers, printers and others. His hon. friend, the member for Dover, had last Session intimated his intention of making a motion on this subject. He begged to ask him if he meant to make such a motion in the present Session? He owned that he thought it would be highly expedient to adopt a proposition, which, while it was calculated to increase the Revenue, was also calculated to diffuse that sound political and religious knowledge which was most essential to the maintenance of good government and social order.

Mr. *Poulett Thomson* said, that it was decidedly his intention to bring forward the Motion to which his noble friend alluded, after Christmas.

DISTRESS.] Mr. *Benett* presented a Petition from the inhabitants of Mere and other places in Wiltshire, complaining of the great Distress under which they were labouring, which they attributed principally to the change in the currency, and praying to be relieved from taxation. The hon. Member characterized the petitioners as a most loyal and well-disposed set of people, and expressed his conviction, notwithstanding the temptation held out to them by what had taken place in another part of the kingdom, that they would not only refrain from outrage, but would be most active in repressing it.

On the Motion for bringing up the Petition,

Mr. *R. Grant* wished to know what his Majesty's Government intended to do in the way of the remission of taxation. An idea had gone very generally abroad, that it was intended to repeal the duty on Sea-borne-coals. He begged to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether that was in contemplation?

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* observed, that his right hon. friend had, the other evening, stated, that great inconvenience must always attend premature disclosures of that nature. He was sure, therefore, that his hon. friend, the member for Norwich, would not attribute his declining to answer the question to any want of courtesy.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* had hoped, after what passed last Session, that a remission would have been proposed of the duty on Sea-borne-coal. He still hoped, that the result of the motion of the hon. member for Limerick would tend to the attainment of so desirable an object. He was aware that this was not a time at which an extensive remission of taxes could be expected, and, therefore, that hopes ought not to be held out which could not be realized. It was his firm conviction, however, that a great advantage would arise from remitting the taxes which pressed on industry, such as the duties on Sea-borne-coals, soap, candles, the house and window-tax, and putting on a tax which would apply to the richer classes.

Sir *John Wrottesley*, judging from the Report of the Committee, was of opinion that a repeal of the Coal-tax would be beneficial only to the great coal-owners. From the monopoly enjoyed by these proprietors of mines in the North, he did not think it probable the public would gain anything by a remission of the duty. The people would be far more benefitted by a repeal of some of the assessed taxes.

Mr. *Bell* declared, that he did not consider hon. Members had any right to interfere with the coal owners in the management of their own affairs. He denied that the coal owners enjoyed a monopoly, but on the contrary there was a great competition amongst them.

Mr. *Tennyson* defended the conduct of the coal owners, but agreed with the hon. Baronet in thinking that a reduction should be made in the assessed taxes.

Sir *R. Wilson* observed, that he was prepared to support a Property-tax, if all practicable reduction in the indirect taxes and in the assessed taxes should prove insufficient to afford relief to the people.

Mr. *Gordon* protested against hon. Members at his side of the House encouraging the Ministers to lay on a Property-tax. Let that House take off the taxes first, and then they would force Ministers to reduce the establishments. This was in his mind the proper course to pursue, and not the reverse, as had been maintained by hon. Members. He contended that the House ought to interfere in the arrangements of the great coal-owners to promote the public good.

General *Gascoyne* asked if it were the intention of Government to re-appoint the China Trade Committees?

Sir *R. Peel* said, the best mode of answering that question, was to give notice that on Monday next he would move for the re-appointment of that Committee.

Mr. *Benett*, before bringing up the Petition, observed, that all taxes affecting production and industry should be removed in the first instance. He declined saying anything respecting a Property-tax. —The Petition laid on the Table.

ENGLISH PENSION LIST.] Mr. *Gordon* asked the right hon. Gentleman, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, if it was his intention, previous to entering upon the discussion respecting the Civil List, to lay before the House the details of the English Pension-list?

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* said, his hon. friend must be aware that the details of the English Pension-list never were given.

Mr. *Gordon* replied, that as his right hon. friend had, upon the present occasion, given many papers which were never given before, such as papers referring to the Scotch Establishment; and considering the declaration made by Government, that they intended to lay all information before the House, he trusted the details of this List would not be withheld.

Mr. *Hume* begged to remind the right hon. Gentleman, that when he made a similar demand in 1828, it was objected to upon the ground that the details could not be brought forward until there was a new settlement of the Civil List. He did not think a single shilling should be voted until all the information that might be required was laid before the House.

Civil List.] The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* said, he considered it would be convenient that previously to the House resolving itself into a Committee to take into consideration that part of his Majesty's Speech which referred to the settlement of the Civil List, he should state the course he intended to pursue. He did not expect the House to come to a decision that night on the Resolutions he should propose. After proposing those Resolutions, and stating his views respecting the future Civil List, which would be in great part matter of detail, he would lay before the House the various necessary documents in a clear form, so that hon. Members might be able to put themselves in full possession of all the information they required before they came to a vote on Monday next.

The House then resolved itself into a Committee on the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman.

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* then spoke to the following effect:—I rise, Sir, pursuant to notice, for the purpose of recommending to the House to fulfil the assurance given to his Majesty, in answer to his gracious Speech from the Throne, that we would cheerfully provide all that was necessary for the support of the Civil Government and the honour and dignity of his Crown; and, Sir, if ever there was an occasion on which a proposition of this nature might dispense with all argument or recommendation upon the part of the individual who moves it, I am sure this is the occasion. I am confident there is not one of those I now have the honour of addressing—that there is not a single man in the country, who will not be forward in the anxious wish to promote the comfort of the Sovereign and the dignity of the Crown. The people of England, always attached to monarchy, have heretofore not only maintained their Sovereigns in comfort and dignity, but have ever been desirous to uphold the Throne in honour and splendor, for they feel a reflected pleasure and glory in the splendor of the Crown. And, Sir, well convinced am I that there never was a period at which a warmer affection or more sincere attachment existed upon the part of the people towards their Sovereign than at present, and this I feel secures to me the universal consent of the people in making such a provision for the Crown as the circumstances of the case require. In asserting this, I do not, however, want to protect my proposition from that examination which is the duty of the House. No, Sir, I am prepared to meet that examination, and to meet it with confidence; although, undoubtedly, objections will be raised against it, and objections of a very different character. On the one hand I may be told that I am not dealing with sufficient liberality; and on the other, I may be reproached with not having a due regard to economy. Yet conscious that I am steering a middle course—avoiding a niggardly parsimony on the one side, and an undue extravagance on the other—I feel that I may submit my proposition in the confidence that it will receive the approbation of the House. Sir, in bringing this subject under the consideration of Parliament, I stand, in some degree, in circumstances different from those under which any individual made a similar proposition in former times. The circumstances under which the settlement of the Civil List has before been made, conferred in themselves, credit upon former Parliaments, and, in the last instance, were highly honourable to the King who lately sat upon the Throne of these realms. To some of these circumstances I must direct the attention of the House, being convinced that they ought to be well considered by us, now engaged in settling the affairs of his present Majesty, for whose dignity and comfort we are called on to provide. The first of these peculiar circumstances is, that in making a proposition of this kind to the House, I am fortunately at the same time able to state, that during the whole of the last reign there was no period at which Parliament was called on to provide for debts incurred upon the Civil List. This is the first time, since the institution of the Civil List, that it was possible to call on Parliament to recollect, that no debt had been incurred since Parliament had last made the arrangement. If the hon. Members of this

House will refer to the documents which are accessible to all, they will find that I am perfectly justified in this assertion. Upon the death of Queen Anne, Parliament had to provide for a considerable debt incurred on the Civil List—a debt amounting to 500,000*l.* On the death of George 1st, Parliament had to provide for a debt incurred upon the Civil List, to the amount of one million. Upon the death of George the 2nd, Parliament had to pay half a million on account of debts incurred upon the Civil List, which had been granted to that Monarch. During the reign of George the 3rd, which extended over so long a period, and in which the events were of a feature so stirring and peculiar, the debts on the Civil List amounted to something between three and four millions. I repeat, therefore, I stand before the House in a peculiar and fortunate situation, in consequence of there now being, at the close of a reign, no debt to defray upon the Civil List granted to the late King. I say, Sir, these circumstances are honourable to the Parliament by which the original arrangement was made, for it proves that it formed so accurate an estimate of what was necessary to maintain the honour and dignity of the Crown, that it became, for the first time in the history of this country, possible for a Monarch to confine his expenditure within the limits assigned him at the settlement of the Civil List. And further, Sir, it is to the credit of that Parliament that it was not only by the liberality of the grant that it succeeded in producing a result so highly to be applauded, but also by the system it devised, and the regulations respecting the expenditure it adopted; for, without a system, and without regulations, never could the object have been effected; and therefore is that Parliament entitled to praise for adopting those particular regulations which led to the happy result I have already stated to the House. Nor, Sir, can we omit to offer the just tribute of praise to the prudence of his late Majesty, in having thus carefully limited himself in his expenditure within the sum granted to him by Parliament, and in having so availed himself of the wise regulations made by Parliament, as to avoid incurring debt which all his predecessors, since the institution of the Civil List, had uniformly incurred. I say, Sir, in the next place, there is another peculiarity attending the proposition I am about to make, which, whatever may be the feeling of the hon. member for Middlesex and his friends respecting the observations I have recently made, ought to call forth the approbation and thanks of this House. We stand, now, in the situation of having surrendered to us, by his Majesty, a greater revenue—greater in the value of its amount, and greater in its numbers of various heads—than Parliament ever had at any former period when a settlement of the Civil List was called for. His Majesty has been graciously pleased to surrender to us, not only the hereditary revenues of the Crown, which were also surrendered to us by the Sovereigns his predecessors, and which, at this present moment, amount to a sum not less than 800,000*l.* per annum, but his Majesty has also given up to us the casual revenues of the Crown, the Droits of the Admiralty and Droits of the Crown, the West-India Duties, and all the other casual revenues of the Crown, which were heretofore left to the peculiar and personal distribution and control of the Crown. The value, Sir, of these concessions is sufficiently apparent from the papers on the Table; but I feel it is not so much for the amount of the concessions that his Majesty is entitled to call for your approbation, as because he now surrenders to you, in surrendering these casual revenues of the Crown, that portion of his revenue which a Monarch could, with the greatest facility, command, in the event of cases arising wherein he was desirous of applying his revenue to purposes which Parliament might not be disposed to sanction. In conceding, therefore, these revenues, the Monarch has deprived himself of the power of applying money to purposes of which Parliament does not approve. His Majesty, consequently, has not only consulted the feelings of the people on the subject of the expenses of the Crown, but also their feelings concerning the objections which might be made to the power of the Sovereign to use his revenue for purposes contrary to the wish of Parliament and to the national liberties. Sir, in making the proposition I am about to submit to the House, it will be my object to avoid all possibility of incurring debt on the Civil List after the arrangement shall have been sanctioned by Parliament. I hold, Sir, that debt, incurred after the settlement of the Civil List, is of all things the most disadvantageous to the Crown, and offensive to the people. In the first place, the very name of debt carries with it the idea of misconduct in the quarter in which it may arise. I do not say in all cases debt in itself implies impropriety of conduct, or deserves reproach ; but I do say, that in all cases the existence of it attaches, to some extent, an imputation of misfortune, of imprudence, or misconduct, and, therefore, that it is not just in the House to make it in the most remote degree necessary for the Monarch to incur debt, and thus render him liable to the imputation I have mentioned. Sir, if there be any advantage in a permanent Civil List (and that there is great advantage we must all admit), it is that, having once given a Civil List to the Crown, we are thenceforth not under the necessity of investigating the private conduct and personal expenditure of the Monarch—which, however agreeable it may be to some individuals—is, to honourable men, and men who really take an interest in the country's welfare, one of the most disagreeable and the most painful tasks which can ever be imposed on Parliament. Therefore, Sir, I consider that the Parliament to which I have already alluded acted well and wisely—and that we shall now act well and wisely in making it the foundation of the Civil List, that there shall be no necessity for incurring any debt by the Crown. The first point, then, we shall have to decide is, what amount for the Civil List is necessary. And, Sir, in cases of this kind, I look upon it as more safe to be directed by experience of the past, than to be guided by calculations of the future. I have, therefore, rather formed the plan by reference to past experience than upon any calculation respecting the future, which I have to submit to the House, making however such changes as the altered circumstances of the Crown seem to render necessary, and bearing always in mind the necessity of keeping the expenditure of the Crown within the bounds prescribed by Parliament. Sir, if we look to the papers on the Table, we may find a statement of what was the full amount of the sums his late Majesty derived from the country for the purposes of the Civil List; and I will, in the first instance, state them to the House, that it may form a just comparison of those sums with the amount I shall ultimately propose to them for the use of his present Majesty. By the Civil List which was voted at the commencement of the last reign, the Sovereign enjoyed an allowance for England of 850,000*l.* and for Ireland of 207,000*l.* At that time it was thought adviseable to leave the hereditary revenue of Scotland untouched, and that amounted to 109,000*l.* So far down all were fixed allowances for the hereditary revenues of the Crown in England, Ireland, and Scotland. Besides these permanent revenues, the Droits of the Admiralty and the Droits of the Crown were left in the power of the Sovereign and they may be taken at an annual average of 32,600*l.* A compensation for additional diplomatic expenditure was allowed amounting to 22,300*l.* and the total of these various sums will amount very nearly to 1,221,000*l.* which was the expenditure during the late reign, for the purposes of the Civil List. Now, Sir, it is my intention to remove from the new Civil List certain charges heretofore imposed upon it, to which I shall advert at a future period. For the purposes of comparison it is necessary that these should be deducted from the sums allowed to his late Majesty. Therefore, on account of them, I take off 166,000*l.* in answer for charges which will not be made in the new Civil List. This will leave in round numbers about 1,055,000*l.* But now, Sir, as to my Resolution, it will be not for grants for the different parts of the kingdom, but for one general grant for the whole kingdom. And on the subsequent arrangement I shall assign classes, for the purpose of presenting a clear view of the different heads of expenditure. What I propose for the purposes of the new Civil List is 970,000*l.*, making a difference between the sum now granted and that allowed to his late Majesty of 85,000*l.* [*Cheers.*] Let not the hon. Member who cheers suppose, that this is the only saving and economy which will be effected; for if he will listen to me a little longer, I will satisfy him that it is far from being the amount of saving and economy which we propose to submit to the notice of the House. In the first place there will be a saving to the State of 38,500*l.* a-year, which was paid to his Majesty when Duke of Clarence. There will likewise be a saving of 15,000*l.* upon civil contingencies. This, then, will be an immediate saving to the State of upwards of 138,000*l.* upon the Civil List. But, Sir, besides, in the formation of this Civil List, it is to be considered that large payments are made on account of pensions, which, though it is not possible to get rid of them immediately, will fall in with the lives of those who now enjoy them; and that there are officers, for whom although we now continue to provide, yet it is our intention that their places, when once vacant, shall not be again filled up. And, Sir, from reductions of this nature previously ordered, and others lately agreed upon, we have a saving in prospective amounting to 13,049*l.* In the next place, the Irish pension list will be reduced from 50,000*l.* to 40,000*l.* per annum; making altogether, when these reductions shall come into effect, a pecuniary saving of 161,000*l.* But, Sir, as I said before, this sum does not present a fair picture of the economy we propose to apply to the Civil List. I need not inform the House, for all men must be aware of it, that there are expenses incident to the situation of his present Majesty from which his predecessor was exempt. The Sovereign, in the present case, is blessed with a royal consort, who shares the affection and respect of the people with his most gracious Majesty. I am sure, Sir, the House would not feel it proper to diminish the amount of the allowance which, for a considerable time past, has been invariably granted to the Queens of England. In the reigns of George 2nd and George 3rd, 50,000*l.* a year was allowed the Queen for the maintenance of her household, and I can see no reason why we should for a moment hesitate to assign to her present Majesty the same allowance which the previous Queens of England uniformly received. Nor, Sir, is the expenditure which the Queen occasions to the Civil List limited to the sum allowed by Parliament for the maintenance of her household. It is obvious that the King, like every other individual, must, when married, add to his expenses in every branch of his establishment. And if the House is disposed to feel surprise that we have not announced a greater reduction in the Civil List, I beg hon. Members to consider the different circumstances under which the two Monarchs are placed, and to take into account the expenses of the Queen, not only for her own household, but also the increase created by her presence in the general establishment—a difference which, by reference to calculations made on former occasions, I am sure I do not over-estimate in naming as an additional expense fully equal to the allowance of her household, and the maintenance of her dignity. The 970,000*l.*, therefore, I have proposed, includes 100,000*l.* for the expenditure occasioned by the presence of her Majesty, and if this be taken into account the comparison between the Civil List we propose for his present Majesty, and that granted to the late Sovereign, will turn out very favourable to our proposition. There is also another branch of expenditure, which formerly was thrown on the public, but from which it is now free, and the amount of which is not inconsiderable. On the death of George 3rd, in conformity with the previous practice of making a provision by way of compensation for the servants of the preceding Monarch, pensions were granted to his servants, and this not upon the Civil List of his successor, but on the Consolidated Fund. On the death of George 3rd, 21,000*l.* was charged upon the Consolidated Fund to pay a compensation to officers in his household; and 19,000*l.* upon the death of Queen Charlotte was charged upon the Consolidated Fund for a similar purpose, making altogether a charge upon the public of 40,000*l.* which the country thought it proper and expedient, and honourable to take upon itself. On the present occasion, however, his Majesty takes the whole compensation to the servants of the late King upon himself. His Majesty has been graciously pleased to adopt into his own service, as far as possible, all the servants of his predecessor; that is to say, all who were capable of performing the duties of their stations; and, therefore, he has considerably reduced the amount of compensation for which it is necessary to provide. But, Sir, notwithstanding this reduction, there is a charge of between 4,000*l.* and 5,000*l.* remaining, which his Majesty will himself provide for, and thus relieve the public from a charge imposed upon it in all former reigns, and which, in the last reign amounted to 40,000*l.* In calculating, therefore, the economy applied to the Civil List, we must not forget, Sir, these two last circumstances—I mean the whole provision for the expenditure occasioned by the Queen, and the compensation to the servants of the late King, for whom it is indispensable to provide. Such, Sir, being the saving we intend to effect, I shall now advert to the arrangements, under which we propose to place the new Civil List. I know, Sir, that on this point there is a great variety of opinions, and I remember that a noble Lord opposite, early in the opening of the Session, expressed a hope that the Civil List now to be presented to the public, would be confined merely to the personal expenses of the Monarch. I, however, after much deliberation, and after weighing maturely all matters connected with the question, must say, that it appears to me not expedient to separate the private and personal expenses of the Monarch from those incurred in his capacity of chief of the Government of the State. First, it is difficult to draw the precise line between the charges incurred by the Monarch in his individual capacity, and those incurred in his public capacity as the person administering the Government of the country; and if it were possible, I do not see that it would be advisable so to separate them, as long as the Civil List can be regulated in such manner as to present a fair, full, and distinct view of the expenditure. I cannot see the particular use of separating these two branches of the Civil List; I do not, therefore propose to withdraw from the Civil List all those charges which have hitherto been considered as belonging to the head of the civil expenditure. I have been anxious to avoid one of the classes of objections now applicable to the Civil List, namely, that which relates to the difficulty of finding the amount of remuneration given to civil officers, whose salaries are paid partly out of the Civil List, and partly from other quarters; and I have, therefore, endeavoured to remove from it those salaries which have been chiefly paid from other quarters, and the difference of which only has been paid from the Civil List. By the plan which I now propose to adopt, the whole salary of every particular officer will be made to appear in each of the particular funds from which it is chiefly paid. Where the larger portion of the salary is paid out of the Civil List, I have annexed to it those smaller portions which are paid from other funds, so that those who may wish to see what is the amount of any particular salary can see it at once, by reference to the Civil List expenditure, without being obliged to have recourse to more than one set of papers for information. I also think the present mode of making deductions from several payments, with a view to form particular funds, is very inconvenient: there is something not very easy to apprehend in the payment, on the one hand, to a particular officer of a very considerable salary, and, on the other, in taking from that officer, at the time of making the payment, a considerable sum to be applied to future and other purposes. I propose, therefore, that all charges and deductions from all salaries shall be omitted in the statement, and that the salaries shall be stated at the precise amount, so that the Civil List shall shew to the public what is the actual amount applicable to the particular services to which the several payments are made. I have stated that I propose to transfer to the Civil List the payment of those salaries the larger portion of which is now chargeable on that branch of the expenditure; and I also propose to transfer to other funds those salaries, only small portions of which are now paid out of the Civil List. The first of the latter class is the salaries of the Judges. But a small portion of these salaries is now paid from the Civil List, the larger portion being paid from the Consolidated Fund. These salaries I therefore propose to transfer entirely to the Consolidated Fund; and if there was any choice from which fund those salaries should be paid, I should think that it would be freest from objection that the emoluments of these officers should be derived from a fund the least liable to the control of the Crown. I propose the same thing with reference to the Speaker of the House of Commons—I may say, with reference to all the other payments of salaries standing on the same footing. In the same way there are certain charges, of which by far the greater amount is defrayed by annual votes of this House, but some portion of which is also taken from the Civil List. These I propose to withdraw entirely from the Civil List, for the purpose of adding them to the several funds from which the greater portion of their amount is now paid. These three several sorts of payments will amount to 166,000*l.* which I shall withdraw from the vote I intend to ask as the vote for the Civil List. Such are the principles of the arrangements which I submit to the House as the foundation of the plan of the new Civil List; but perhaps the House will pardon me if I go a little more into detail on the several classes into which I propose the Civil List shall be divided. These classes will be ten in number. The first class will consist of his Majesty's privy purse, and of her Majesty's establishment. This class, instead of being 60,000*l.*, as under the late King, will now amount to 110,000*l.*, a sum which was always charged so long ago as before the reign of George 1st.; the difference between the present and the last Civil List being altogether occasioned as I have already stated by the presence of her Majesty the Queen. The second head or class of expenditure is that of the salary of the great officers of the household—of the household establishment—and of the officers connected therewith. This makes up a sum of about 140,546*l.*; and that sum will comprise salaries which before were to be found under other heads. Among these are the gentlemen pensioners, and certain officers of ceremony, which appear to me better placed here than elsewhere. Under this head there will be observed some reduction of amount from that which was stated for similar charges in the former reign. With respect to the household itself, the third head of the expenditure, there will not be any actual reduction of expenditure—I mean in the bills of the tradesmen who supply his Majesty. I know that the hon. member for Middlesex will say that there ought to be some reduction in that respect, having regard to the present value of provisions, which is much less than when the last Civil List was framed. I acknowledge that there has been a decrease in the price of provisions, and in all the necessary articles of life, since the last Civil List was agreed to; but while I admit that to be the fact, I must at the same time remind the hon. Member, that some increase is necessary on account of her Majesty. I have, therefore, in addition to the expenditure of his Majesty, brought in, under this head, that of the Queen; and I think that if the bills now paid are carefully compared with those formerly charged, there will be found to have been an actual reduction, although that reduction is not at once apparent, on account of the cause of increased expenditure to which I have already referred. The amount of this class of expenditure will be 210,500*l.*, a sum which exhibits an apparent increase on the former Civil List, but which, in reality, is less, since the present estimate includes the expense of Messengers, and other items of the Civil Department, which I have thought it more convenient to place here, instead of letting them remain under other heads of expenditure. The fourth class consists of the Royal Bounties, Charities, and Special Service Money, and these come more nearly within what are properly called the particular expenditure of the Crown. The amount here is the same as before, 22,250*l.* The fifth class consists of the pensions on the Civil List. This item was fixed by Mr. Burke at a sum of 95,000*l.*, but in the present Civil List it will amount to no more than 74,200*l.*, the difference between the two being those charges which are deducted from the Civil List, and carried to other heads of expenditure, on the principle I have already mentioned. The sixth class comprises the expenses of Foreign Missions and Ministers of State. I have stated, that in weighing the different arguments for excluding these charges from the Civil List of the Crown, my feelings have preponderated in favour of retaining them under this head of expenditure, and I therefore present them to the House as part of the expense of the Civil List; and whatever opinions may be entertained on this point, I have no doubt that, with respect to the amount required for this head of expenditure, the House will be satisfied with the sum which is now proposed for the payment of this particular service. Under the former arrangements of the Civil List, the third class, with which the sixth class now corresponds, comprised not only the expense of Foreign Missions, but also the salaries of a portion of the present Consular Establishment; and the House will also recollect, that in addition to those who were then Ministers at Foreign Courts, with salaries, we have been latterly called on for additional Ministers to the new States of South America, and that these Ministers were, of course, not provided for in the Civil List of 1820. This class of public servants, with which we have now to deal, comprises the representatives of the King in all parts of the world, but does not comprise the Consular establishments, for reasons which I will presently state. In the former Session of Parliament, when the question of Diplomatic Expenditure was under consideration, I stated, that endeavours were making by the noble Lord at the head of the Foreign Department to bring the present expenditure for twenty-five ministers,—the increase in our Diplomatic Establishments having been rendered necessary by the change in the circumstances and conditions of several States both in Europe and America,—within the amount which was provided for eighteen Foreign Ministers. This class will show, that what I then stated to be under consideration, has been now done. In every foreign mission (with, at least, only two exceptions) a great reduction of expense will be found to have taken place. The amount is now stated at 140,000*l.*, which was 165,000*l.* in the preceding year; and that year itself exhibited a diminished expense, as compared with the sums required for preceding years; and when the detail of these estimates has been examined, I think that the House will agree with me that the Government has been disposed to bring down these charges as low as was compatible with the rank of the individual employed, and the nature of the service he was engaged in. If, in examining these items, persons will inform themselves of what are the emoluments of other Ministers resident at the same Courts, they will find, though there are many circumstances which necessarily render our Ministers more expensive than other foreign ministers at the same place, and though Englishmen are more disposed to travel and visit foreign countries than men of other nations, yet their charges are not superior, nor, in some instances, even equal to those of other Ambassadors. I have said, that there are two exceptions to the great reductions we have made. The first of these is Paris; the other Petersburgh. They are stations where a great expenditure is required beyond that demanded at any other Court, so that we do not propose to withdraw from those Ambassadors the emoluments which they now enjoy. The reductions of which I have spoken cannot, indeed, be immediately accomplished, so that the diminution of expenditure will not come into full operation till the 1st of January in the ensuing year. The reduction of salaries, however, is not the only economy which we have effected. It will appear that the extraordinary charges, which are a great source of diplomatic expenditure, are now about to be brought within very narrow limits. Take the question of outfit, for instance, which in former Civil Lists was stated at 76,000*l.*, and which is now estimated only at 47,000*l.* The expense of half outfit is also reduced from 50,000*l.* to 30,000*l.* On other charges there are likewise deductions, as in the cases of absence on account of private affairs, and in the allowances for conveyance of baggage, which are now reduced within very narrow limits. The details of what I have stated will be found in the papers I have laid on the Table—papers which show that we have, in fact, adopted that economy which this House desired, and which the Government promised. With respect to the payments to be made in future on account of the Consular Department, I propose that a considerable alteration shall take place. A sum of 30,000*l.* was formerly paid for the expenses of the Consular establishment out of the Civil List, and 60,000*l.* from a vote of Parliament: I propose that, in future, Parliament shall provide all the expenses of the Consular establishment by an annual vote. One of the reasons for my proposing this is, the change in the regulations of that establishment which may at any time take place. A change in our Consular regulations was recommended to Parliament, not only by merchants, but by hon. Members, who had no especial interest in the recommendation, and who were actuated by no feeling but a desire for the good of the country. That change led to a great increase of expenditure in the Consular department, and it appeared to the noble Lord at the head of that department, that that expenditure should be brought within our more limited means, and that it would be advisable to make its amount an item of the charges that were annually to be submitted to the vote of the Parliament. The total amount of this class of Civil expenditure is now stated at 186,000*l.* for the charges of Ministers on service, and for the pensions of retired Ministers, including all the Consuls formerly residing at foreign Courts, together with those new Consuls now appointed to Greece and South America. The seventh class consists of the small charges on the Hereditary Revenues of the Crown, which always have been defrayed out of the Civil List, on which humorous remarks have sometimes been made in Parliament, but which are still necessary to be maintained. These charges amounted to 13,700*l.* The eighth class relates to the salaries of the great Officers of State, who are now paid out of the Civil List. Among these are the Lord Chancellor, the Lord President of the Council, the Lord Privy Seal, the Commissioners of the Treasury, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. In this class is to be included that portion of the salaries of Public Officers, which is now payable out of the Civil List of Ireland, and out of the Consolidated Fund, so that the effect of this arrangement will be, that all these salaries can at once be seen from these papers. This class will form an item of 24,000*l.* The ninth class is the Civil List of Ireland. That Civil List amounted to 207,000*l.* in the reign of his late Majesty; but it is now reduced to 125,000*l.*, and even part of that consists of charges for offices, the duration of which is limited to the lives of the present occupants and my plan embraces a proposal that will effect a further reduction from 50,000*l.* to 40,000*l.* With respect to the last class—the Civil List for Scotland—I do not think it will be found liable to any objections. It chiefly consists of a provision for the hereditary Officers of State in that kingdom, for the support of the Universities there, and for the payment of the Professors at those Universities—charges which have always been borne by the Civil List of Scotland, and which are so moderate in their amount, that I am confident, when they come to be examined by the House, every one will be convinced of our disposition to reduce the expenditure within the narrowest limits. This class amounts to a sum of 51,000*l.* The Civil List, on the arrangement thus proposed, will amount to 960,000*l.* of which an accurate estimate will be found in the papers I now lay on the Table. It is quite obvious that in submitting an estimate of this nature, it is impossible not to leave an opening for some future contingency; and, adopting as a principle that which was acted on in 1820, I shall propose to take a vote for a sum above the estimate, in order to meet these contingencies. I shall, however, only increase the vote so far above the estimate as will be necessary to preserve the Civil List from debt. In proposing, therefore, the sum of 970,000*l.* I shall propose a small excess, which is not more than necessary, because the Crown, having now surrendered the Droits of the Crown, and the Droits of the Admiralty, has withdrawn from itself the means which were before at its disposal, and it is not therefore unreasonable that a small additional vote should be given to meet those contingencies, which, in the best state of the Civil List, must be liable to occur, and which, during the late reign, rendered a provision of this sort absolutely necessary. I have thus gone through the statement of the Civil List, which I am now about to submit to the approbation of the House; and I think I have shewn that a considerable saving has been effected under the new arrangement. I may, perhaps, be permitted to state more in detail what that saving is. In the first place, there is an immediate saving of 138,900*l.*, and then there is a contingent saving of 162,000*l.*; and moreover it should be borne in mind that the Civil List has provided for charges which exceed, by the sum of 100,000*l.*, those which were to be defrayed out of the Civil List of the former reign; yet have we been able to reduce the whole sum to the extent I have stated, at a time when, from particular circumstances, the Civil List is burthened with additional charges to the amount of 100,000*l.* I cannot doubt that the House will be satisfied with this statement. I know that there is no disposition in this House, or in the country to refuse what is necessary to maintain the dignity and splendor of the Crown. I know, indeed, that the proper splendor of the Crown is endeared to every class of the people. If this is the case, whatever may be the character of the Monarch on the Throne, I am sure that that sentiment is now more than ever warmly felt by the whole people of England, when both the Monarch and his Consort possess all the characteristics which can endear them to the hearts of their subjects, and when the people unite, as they have done, in the strongest expression of attachment to the Sovereign, whose conduct, whether examined in the relations of domestic life, or in his public character, deservedly recommends him to the best affections of the people. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by moving, "That for the support and maintenance of his Majesty's Household, and the honour and dignity of the Crown, there be granted to his Majesty the annual sum of 970,000*l.* during his Majesty's life, and that the said Revenue shall be made payable out of the Consolidated Fund." The right hon. Gentleman observed, before he sat down, that he did not mean to press for a vote that evening.

Lord *Althorp* said, that he could not vote on this question without making a few observations on the statement of the right hon. Gentleman. In remarking upon this proposed provision for the Civil

List of his Majesty, it was not necessary to follow the right hon. Gentleman into the minute details of his plan. Indeed, it would be impossible for him or others to do so immediately after hearing the statement of the right hon. Gentleman. The subject into which he had entered was too extensive to be at once disposed of. He did not think it possible for that House, or a committee of the whole House, to go sufficiently into detail on this subject, to be able to satisfy either the public or themselves. He was of opinion, that it was absolutely necessary that those minute details into which the right hon. Gentleman had gone, should be examined in a Select Committee. He was convinced, that if the House attempted to examine the details of the right hon. Gentleman's plan, as they were now stated, it would be found that the Members could not clearly understand them, and could come to no satisfactory result. The right hon. Gentleman's plan, instead of being a simplified statement of the demands upon the Civil List; was a statement more complicated than ever. The right hon. Gentleman had added to the difficulty by his plan of borrowing from one fund to pay to another, for the purpose of lessening or increasing, according to circumstances, the amount of the Civil List. As far as he had been able to follow the plan of the right hon. Gentleman, he had not been able to approve of it in any degree. It would be difficult for the country to understand what the House voted if Members should consent to the vote in the form in which it was proposed, the right hon. Gentleman had placed in it so many items of expenditure which did not in the least belong to the dignity, comfort, or splendor of the Crown. What was the consequence of this? Why, that if the Civil List was voted in the manner now proposed, the House would appear to be giving to the Crown 970,000*l*., when, in point of fact, all that the Crown would receive would be found to be comprised in the three first of the classes into which the right hon. Gentleman had divided the whole scheme. He should be inclined to say, that the Civil List of the Crown should extend only to those branches of expenditure which related to the Monarch himself. He could not conceive what addition it was to the splendor, dignity or comfort of his Majesty, to have money paid to him for the mere purpose of being paid out again, for matters which did not appertain to his Majesty personally, but to the diplomatic service of the country. He did not know why the expenses of Ambassadors, like the charges for Consuls, should not be annually brought under the view of Parliament, in order that Parliament might know that the Ministers really practised the economy that was demanded of them. One inconvenience among the rest, that would arise from the adoption of the right hon. Gentleman's plan, was, that if the change he proposed took place, the House would be in a great state of confusion, part of the supplies of expenditure being taken from the Civil List, and part from the annual votes of the year. In like manner he must say, he could notunderstand why the great Public Officers, the Lords of the Treasury, and the other Officers of State, who had been named together with the right hon. Gentleman himself, should be charged upon the Civil List, when their salaries might as well be paid with other branches of expenditure by an annual vote of that House. It appeared to him that the proposition of the right hon. Gentleman was one which, instead of giving a clear account of the items in the Civil List for the present reign, continued all that confusion which had previously existed, with the exception only of a few trifling Amendments. As the vote on this question was not to be taken to-night, he would not detain the House further than by repeating, that he could not approve of the plan now brought forward by the right hon. Gentleman.

Sir *H. Parnell* addressed the House in support of the observations of the noble Lord who had just resumed his seat. He was compelled however to acknowledge that like the noble Lord he felt the greatest difficulty in following the statement of the right hon. Gentleman. The saving he mentioned was very trifling, and the House ought to recollect that the estimate of the Civil List for 1820, which had been referred to by the right hon. Gentleman, was founded on that made in 1815, which was monstrously extravagant. The expenditure of the country was then altogether too large; and prices were much higher than at present. It seemed to him impossible for the House to come to a decision on the merits of the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman, without having a further inquiry than it was now possible for them to make. He thought that the House ought to make a separation between the public and the private expenditure of his Majesty, and not appear to grant him a revenue which was, in fact, to be consumed by others. The necessity of each particular item of expenditure ought to be distinctly shown, and it ought to be kept distinct from every other. From the want of that separation in the grant of former Civil Lists, much confusion had arisen, and much of that extravagance which had drawn the country into the state in which it was now. It was utterly impossible for any individual Member of that House to know, from the plan of the right hon. Gentleman, what was the expenditure of money for the maintenance of the Government and for the public service. Until the separation he had alluded to had taken place, nothing like a fair estimate could be made; and when the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had the opportunity of simplifying the matter, had increased the confusion in which it was before involved, the House had little reason to feel the satisfaction which the right hon. Gentleman seemed to anticipate. He said, therefore, that a fuller inquiry was necessary, in order to lay the foundation of a general improvement of the manner in which public accounts were laid before the House. Although that might appear to some a trifling matter, he was of opinion that it was really a matter of importance; and unless something was done to simplify the statement of the public accounts, the House would perpetually be encountered by difficulties, in their attempt to effect that retrenchment which the country expected at their hands. If the public accounts were suffered to be made out in the slovenly way they were at present kept, no man could understand them; and it would be impossible for them to have an effectual control over the public expenditure. He hoped, therefore, they would proceed with caution, and require from the Government the appointment of a committee, to examine into the details of the statement just made by the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. *Hume* could not let this discussion pass without expressing his great regret at the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman. He confessed that the speech he had heard, much disappointed him, as, he believed it would disappoint the whole country. When they heard the gracious declaration of his Majesty on the subject of economy, he submitted that the House must show their respect for it, by calling on the Ministers to act in accordance with that declaration. He was perfectly prepared to do all that was necessary to promote the comfort of his Majesty, and to uphold the dignity of the Crown. He was prepared to do that to the fullest extent which the present state of the country would allow, and to act towards his Majesty with the utmost possible degree of liberality. He could not think that the right hon. Gentleman had taken the course they had a right to expect, even on his own showing; for he had referred to reports of committees as the ground on which he submitted his proposition. Reports on this subject were made in 1803, 1812, and 1815. He would not read them, but he would state the subject of them to the House. While each deplored the gradually increasing charge of the Civil List, they all declared that that increase was unavoidable, because the price of every necessary of life, and every article of expenditure, had increased. The reports referred to the private knowledge of each Member for a confirmation of this fact, and then declared that the increased charge of the expenditure was occasioned by the increase of price of every thing in the country. From that statement of the cause of the increase, what was now to be expected from the right hon. Gentleman? Why, that he should decrease the expenditure of the Civil List, at least in the degree in which the necessary articles of life had decreased in price. Instead of that, the right hon. Gentleman took the data of 1816 for the formation of his present plan—a year, in which the expenditure of this country was most profligate and extravagant; and asked the House to continue that expenditure, with the exception of some very paltry reductions. Why did he ask this? Because his Majesty had graciously made certain concessions of his hereditary revenues; but when he alluded to that subject, he ought to have stated what were the concessions made by William 4th, above those made by George 4th? The paper he (Mr. Hume) held in his hand consisted of thirteen items, which William 4th proposed to give up beyond those given up by George 4th. Those items might be found at page 180 of the Parliamentary

Papers of last Session. The first item related to the Droits of the Crown and Admiralty, and amounted to 1,229*l.*; the second to Droits of the Admiralty, and amounted to 284*l.*; the third consisted of the 4½-per-cent Duties, which he put down at *nil*, for the whole of them had already been transferred to the support of the hierarchy of the West-Indies. It was true, that if at any future period the expense of the Bishops of the West-Indies should amount to less than 21,000*l.*, and these duties should exceed that sum, the balance might be appropriated to the public accounts. On this point, in fact, there had been no concession, and for 150 years a large sum had been taken from a portion of the colonies, that the King might grant pensions to individuals whom he wished to favour. The next item was the Receiver General of Gibraltar, the nett receipts of last year being only 180*l.*: this was a gift on the part of the Crown noble and liberal, and though the sum was small the principle was very important. He had had occasion at former times to complain of the manner in which the King had levied taxes at Gibraltar that he might put the proceeds into his pocket, and on an average of the last seven years the sum might amount to 9,000*l.* or 10,000*l.* The casual revenues of the Crown might amount annually to about 9,000*l.*, and the sum stated against the Receiver General of Green Wax, in respect of Green Wax, was 41*l.* The Coroner and Attorney of the King, 104*l.*; the King's Proctor, 8,164*l.*; and the Commissioners of the Affairs of Taxes, 584*l.* The Auditor of the Land Revenue of England, *nil;* the same of Wales, 75*l.*; the produce of Spices, arising from the capture of the Molucca Islands, 309*l.*; Inspector of Fines and Penalties, 864*l.*; together with other items, amounting last year in the whole (as appeared by the Parliamentary Paper laid upon the Table pursuant to the Act 1 Geo. 4th), to only 24,000*l.* Let every Member bear in mind that 24,000*l.* was the whole sum relinquished under this head, exclusive of the revenues derived from Scotland. He, therefore, did not think, as far as regarded amount, that his Majesty was entitled to any great credit for what he had conceded; in principle, however, it was of immense importance that the King should divest himself of the power of interfering with these different departments, small as they were, and that he should afford an opportunity of simplifying the public accounts, so that they might be laid before Parliament in a shape at once clear and intelligible. There he thought that the King had been well advised, and much good might be the result. No individual in this or in any former Parliament had regretted more deeply than he had done the complex manner in which the various items included in the Civil List had been stated. That Civil List had been the means of supporting a large aristocratical body—the odium of which the King was obliged to bear; he had been made to keep up establishments in no wise connected with his household, and in no degree contributing to his personal comfort or to his regal dignity, and merely for the maintenance of an aristocratical interest. He held in his hand the Act of 1 Geo. 4th, in which the payments out of the Civil List were separated into eight divisions, and the House would see, when properly examined, how small a portion actually belonged to his Majesty's household. He allowed all the first class, amounting to 210,000*l.*; but what had the second class to do with the King's household, consisting, as it did, of payments to the Speaker of the House of Commons—to the Judges of the King's Courts—to the Barons of the Exchequer, and to the Justices of Wales, amounting to 32,000*l.*? These were unconnected with the comfort of the King and the dignity of the Crown, and ought to be voted by Parliament. The third class related to Ambassadors at foreign Courts, and what had they to do with his Majesty's household? Only this—that if there were by chance any overplus—any sum not required—Ministers took good care that it should be applied in some way or other. Why did he say so? Because, by 1 Geo. 4th, any sum not appropriated out of the 206,000*l.* there set apart, was to be returned to the Exchequer. Mr. Canning, indeed, in three years, had taken great credit to the Government for returning to the Exchequer two sums—one of 7,000*l.*, and the other of 13,000*l.*—under this clause, but his successors had not effected a saving even to that extent. The fourth class in the Act was a most important branch, including the Lord Steward's department, and those of the Lord Chamberlain, the Master of the Robes, the Surveyor of the Works, &c. The sum granted for these officers in 1820 was 215,000*l.*, and in the last year it was 221,000*l.* Under Mr. Burke's bill of 1786, the whole amount so appropriated was 147,000*l.*, and to that scale we ought now to return. The fifth class was that of tradesmen's bills, which unquestionably belonged to the Royal household. One of the great abuses of the Civil List was, that the King should have the power to give away 200,000*l.* or 300,000*l.* in pensions; the public, indeed, provided the money; 90,000*l.* for one class of pensioners, 50,000*l.* for another, and 38,000*l.* for a third; and he asked whether the country was in a condition to pay such enormous sums for such purposes? He was most anxious to lighten the public burthens, and he hoped that, if a committee were appointed, it would not fail to inquire into the pensions granted by his late Majesty. While distress and starvation were staring the people in the face, it was not the time to continue the dead weight of useless pensioners. Not one man in twenty of them deserved such a reward, which was conferred only from favour and affection. Henceforward the Crown ought not to have the power of granting a single pension, excepting out of the savings of the Privy Purse. When the public paid the money, the public ought to be satisfied that it was properly applied. What was the result of an examination of the present Pension-list? That Peers and Peeresses, their sons, daughters, cousins, kith and kin, who possessed parliamentary influence, were extravagantly paid for doing nothing. The time was come when there must be an end of that system; a cheap Government was now the one thing needful, and relief for the people, by cutting off all needless expenses, must be granted. At least it was clear that the pensions charged on the Civil List had no connexion with the Royal household. The next class in the Act 1 Geo. 4th included the Lord President of the Council, the Constable of Dover Castle, the Master of the Hawks, the Chief Justice of Ireland, &c. How were these offices part of the Royal household? What did the petitions with which the Table was crowded pray? Not that the King should be deprived of a single comfort, a single luxury, or of anything necessary to support the dignity of the Crown. They only besought the House to put an end to all unnecessary expenses; and upon this point he wished to know why the Constable of Dover Castle was to have 4,000*l.* a year out of the Civil List?

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* said, across the Table, that that office had been abolished some years ago.

That may be, continued Mr. Hume, but I only know that I find the item among the payments of last year.

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* was understood to add, that the office had been abolished prospectively.

Mr. *Hume:*—What, then, will the right hon. Gentleman say to the office of Master of the Hawks? Who keeps hawks now? I know not, but I believe that no man has any business to keep them. When the poor of the country are starving, is it a time for giving a pension to the Master of the Hawks? In addition to this, here is a list as long as a tailor's bill, of pensions altogether unnecessary, and which, of course, ought to be abolished. I submit, therefore, that all these items, instead of being glossed over by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, ought to be submitted to the test of a committee. It is a question whether the nation can afford to pay some expenses of the kind that appear even necessary. We have heard declarations—nay, vows of economy—and what interpretation can be put upon that part of the King's most gracious Speech, but that he wishes every practicable retrenchment to be made? If his Ministers would but give his Majesty wholesome advice, there was no man in the kingdom more ready to follow it. I now arrive at the seventh class—the salaries of the Commissioners of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I wish the just salaries of all useful public servants to be paid; but is there any reason why they should be put upon the Civil List? National expenses ought to be paid out of the national purse. In the eighth class—occasional payments—the greater number ought indisputably to come before the House of Commons. I will state one or two of them. Here I find no less than 10,000*l.* a year for what is called "home secret service," independent of the 50,000*l.* paid for secret service generally. Then we come to "special service and Royal bounty;" but I apprehend that the King's liberality ought to be limited by his means. If those means are insufficient, and the object be a good one, let his Majesty come to Parliament, and he will not be sparingly dealt with. What conclusion, then, do I come to? This:—That the only items in Mr. Burke's Bill of 1786, and the only items at the present moment, that ought to be charged upon the Civil List, are the first, fourth, and fifth classes, viz.:—The Privy Purse for the King and Queen; the Establishment of the Household, and the Tradesmen's Bills for that Establishment, amounting to 291,000*l.*; or, including 50,000*l.* for the Queen, to 349,000*l.* Last year, the charge under these three heads was the following:—For the Privy Purse, 60,000*l.*; for the Lord Chamberlain, and other Officers of the Household, 215,000*l.*; and for Tradesmen's Bills, 137,000*l.*—making in the whole only 412,000*l.* out of the 1,120,000*l.* granted for the Civil List. Not one shilling more, I contend, is necessary for the comfort and dignity of the Crown. On that ground, I contend, that this House cannot be prepared to vote the 970,000*l.* now required, and that the Commons of England are bound to inquire, before they come to any decision upon the subject. If the sum necessary for the Royal Household were separated, as it ought to be, from other charges not at all connected with it, the King would be relieved from the odium under which he now labours—that so large a sum as nearly a million is annually required for his own personal expenses. Of this I am sure, that nothing but an investigation before a committee can enable this House to come to a vote, if it have any wish to perform its duty to the public. Let me remind it, that this is not the first, nor the sixth time, that hon. Members near me have contended for a diminution of the Civil expenditure of the Crown: when they have so contended, they have been uniformly met with this answer—that a bargain had been made at the commencement of the reign, and that the compact having been entered into, it could not be broken. The proper time for making reductions of the kind is at the commencement of a new reign—that time is now arrived—a fresh bargain is now to be made; and when the Table groans with petitions, and will hereafter groan under a ten-fold weight of petitions we are bound to obtain the fullest information before we enter into a new contract. We ought not to allow ourselves to be taken by surprise in the ebullition of the moment, and with such a complication of accounts as renders them utterly unintelligible. I hope, therefore, that the noble Lord (Althorp) will move for a Committee on an early day: and if the papers are printed and delivered to-morrow, I do not see how we can take them into consideration before Wednesday or Thursday. Without previous inquiry we cannot be prepared to say what sum ought or ought not to be granted, and without that inquiry we shall not do our duty to our constituents. At all events, I protest against the arrangement proposed — it is uncalled for and complicated, and will be received with disappointment, if not with indignation, by the people.

Mr. *Brougham*: I cannot pretend to say, that I have yet formed a decided opinion upon the great question before the House, but I am inclined to agree with my noble friend near me (Lord Althorp) that even after the promised papers are in our hands further information will be necessary. The subject is of the utmost importance in itself, and in connexion with others — in its constitutional relations, and, above all, on account of the interests it excites among our constituents. Until we have full knowledge, we ought not to proceed to anything like a final adjudication: I therefore am disposed to support the proposition of my noble friend for a committee, and the reason urged by my hon. friend (Mr. Hume) is precisely the ground on which I arrive at that conclusion. We are making an arrangement which is to last during the life of his Majesty, and however we may hereafter find that we have been in the wrong, we may be told—and justly told—that it is too late to re-open the contract: the bargain has been made, and until the demise of the Crown it cannot be altered. As I confidently hope, and earnestly pray, that that event may be long postponed, it becomes more and more our imperative duty not to enter, as it were, blindfold into such a permanent arrangement. The last arrangement was made, I believe, in the year 1815: the people are now more awake to their own interests, but I am sorry to say that they have not the same confidence either in the Executive Government or in the Parliament, which they evinced at the date I have mentioned. I can only say, that I heartily concur in the objections stated by my noble friend; the simplifying of the accounts would be a vast improvement.

This has been frequently called a trading nation, and every private individual keeps a check upon his expenditure and the dealings of his servants; he keeps an accurate and intelligible system of accounts; every merchant, without exception, does so, or he would soon find his way into the gazette. That in public affairs, so infinitely more important, a plain, rational, intelligible, certain, and natural system, should be superseded by a system unplain, irrational, unintelligible, uncertain, and not in the least natural, is indeed most extraordinary. The exigency for simple accounts, where even the interest upon the debt amounts to many millions, is ten-fold increased. The amount does not one jot add to the difficulty, for it is just as easy to keep a system of accounts where millions as where units are concerned. This is a point which every body knows, even the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I own I had some difficulty in following the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, and I should, perhaps, say, that it was my fault if I did not find that my difficulty was shared by my hon. friends round me. It appears to me, that instead of taking this occasion to simplify matters, he has added to their confusion; he has talked of subtraction and addition, and added, apparently, only to subtract; for that novel course—novel with any body else—I, for one, do not see the absolute necessity. It seems to me to be most unreasonable, absurd, and unfair, towards the King, that he should apparently cost the country three or four times as much as his actual expenditure. It is well known among us, that the King does not spend nearly the half of the money we are called upon to vote; but out of doors it is generally thought that he consumes every farthing of it, and comparisons are every day made between the cost of a King of England and of a president of the United States. "See (say those ignorant of matters of finance of this kind) the difference between a Republic and a Monarchy: the President of the United States is paid 5,000*l.* or 6,000*l.* a-year. and the King of England more than a million." This comparison is exceedingly unjust and inaccurate; but whose fault is it that it is made? Nor ought we to be much surprised that the people fall into a trap which year after year Ministers take so much pains to dig for them. Milton preferred a republic to a monarchy, because, as he said, the mere trappings of a monarchy would fit out a republic; and what course then can be more fit or natural for us to take than to separate the trappings from the substance, and to take from the charge of the Civil List the expenses of foreign Ministers, and many others that have no sort of connexion with it? Do we take this course; and what is the course which we actually follow? We, in our wisdom, take a great deal of what is not trapping, and, by covering it with gloss and slime, we not only make it appear trapping, but we exaggerate it beyond its proper dimensions. Such a proceeding is most unfair to the King at all times: it is at all times bad policy, but most especially bad in times like these. The King is a popular and justly beloved Monarch; but we endeavour to make his people watch, maliciously watch him, and draw odious and unjust comparisons. It is our fault, not theirs; it is unjust and impolitic to the cause of limited Monarchy, and the blindness and blunders of statesmen are loading it with sins that do not belong to it. Another word as to my disappointment, and the disapppointment of the country, regarding the surrenders and savings by the Crown. First as to the savings. It may be my error, but it seems to me that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has made out the savings to be greater than they really are. When he talks of 130,000*l.* or 140,000*l.* let me ask him whether he deducts the expenses of his royal highness the Duke of Clarence? Of course we there must save 38,000*l.* a-year, for he cannot be King and Duke of Clarence at the same time. We have just as good a right to deduct the allowances of the Dukes of Kent and York, but whether they have been deducted I know not. Do not let the right hon. Gentleman or any body else attempt to mislead the people: it may succeed for eight and forty hours, but no longer. Then as to the hereditary revenues of the Crown, I did hope, and I expressed my gratitude, founded upon that hope, that the Duchy of Lancaster would be included in the cession by his Majesty, I now find that it is not included. The King's speech turns out to have been constructed on a plan much the reverse of that on which speeches are usually made; they are generally intended to be understood, but the object here seems to have been to render the King's Speech unintelligible. It talks of foreign interference, and yet we have every day since been told that it means no such thing. Another part of it led me to think that the hereditary revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster were to be relinquished. This sense seemed expressed in the largest and most comprehensive terms that could be employed, and it forms my excuse for having formed unfounded expectations; "I place (said the King or he was made to say) without reserve at your disposal my interest in the hereditary revenues, and in those funds which may be derived from any droits of the Crown or Admiralty, from the West-India duties, or from any casual revenues either in my foreign possessions or in the United Kingdom." That is to say, "I surrender all my revenues, casual or otherwise, at home or abroad;" and the expression is so wide and sweeping that I had no doubt that the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster, aye, and of Cornwall too, were included. No doubt I shall be told by the Attorney General who was Attorney General for the Duchy of Lancaster, and who is full of that jealousy natural to a single Attorney General, much more to a double one — that the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster are not the hereditary revenues of the Crown.—[*Some Member cried, hear, hear!*]. — That cheer comes from a lawyer, I am sure [*laughter.* The hon. Member rose in his place.] The hon. Gentleman, I see, is a civilian; but his distinction shows, that he would have been an ornament to the profession. He means to say, that his Majesty does not receive the revenues to the Duchy of Lancaster as king, but as Duke; and that, from ignorance or inadvertence, I have put a wrong construction on the words, "I place without reserve, at your disposal, my interest in the hereditary revenues" of the Crown. But let us recollect that the King is Duke both of Lancaster and of Cornwall; and thus an ignorant man —not the Duke of Wellington—might be misled by the expression I have quoted. If the framer of the speech really wished the people to understand him, he has pursued a very strange course; and I would advise him, in the interval of his public duties, to disport himself with a few grammatical exercises. The first page of the first grammar he could take up, would inform him, that "the use of speech is, to be understood by those who hear." If I had meant to include the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster, I should have used the very terms which it seems the author of this grammatical contradiction employed with the intention of excluding them. When his Majesty tells us, that he places without reserve at our disposal his interest in the hereditary revenues of the Crown, and in those funds which go into his possession from any casual revenues, at home or abroad, is it not natural for us to conclude that he gives up the hereditary revenues of the Crown from whatever source derived; and is it not the Duke of Lancaster who speaks as well as the King? His Majesty does not go down to Lancaster or Preston, to make one speech as Duke of Lancaster, and return to London, to make another speech as King of England. The distinction is a mere quibble, and if not made by a lawyer, give me leave to say it is worthy of the ingenuity of the most astute special pleader. The abandonment by the King in his Speech was an abandonment of the whole without reserve or exception. After what has passed to night, I do not say it was intended; it is a blunder in the King's Speech—a blunder by the Minister—a blunder arising out of sheer stupidity and utter ignorance of the meaning of language; there seems to have existed a total indifference whether the Royal Address was or was not understood, and whether it did or did not express the intention of the high personage by whom it was delivered. Giving satisfaction to the people was out of the question, and perhaps from the time of Charles 2nd or James 2nd to the present hour, there never was a speech from the Throne which produced in the country such a uniform and strong feeling of indignation. If any county Member differs from me, he has only to rise and assert that his constituents are well satisfied; and, no doubt, next Monday or Tuesday, he may again rise, and again assert that his constituents are also satisfied with the diminution of the Civil List, and with the vast improvement in the simplification of the accounts. Give me leave to add, that this question is of infinite importance to the stability of the Monarchy—to the character of the King, and to the character of Parliament, and I, therefore, hail with satisfaction the notice given by my noble friend (Lord Althorp), or by the hon. Baronet, the member for Queen's county (Sir H. Parnell), to take the sense of the House on the moderate, rational, and judicious course of referring this subject to the investigation of a Select Committee.

Sir *Robert Peel*: The observations of the hon. and learned Member seem to me to call for some reply—[Mr. Brougham here rose, as if to leave the House, but Sir R. Peel requested him to remain.]—It is certainly unusual for a Member to charge a Government with sheer stupidity and gross ignorance; and when a vindication is about to be attempted, for him to leave the House: but I do not ask the hon. and learned Member to remain in his place that he may hear my answer, but that he may listen to a charge against him of gross ignorance on his part. I did not think it right to accuse him in his absence, and I therefore entreated him to retain his seat. He asserts that Government have been guilty of gross ignorance and want of the common knowledge of grammatical construction—that they also had the intention to mislead, inasmuch as they have put into the King's mouth a proposal to resign all interest in the hereditary revenues of the Crown, and thus exciting an expectation that the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster, among others, were to be relinquished. The hon. and learned Gentleman contends that there ought to have been contained in the speech a distinct explanation that his Majesty did not mean to relinquish his interest in the hereditary revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster; and with a view to this point, it is material to refer to the language of former Sovereigns, when they have invited the settlement of their Civil List. George 4th relinquished his interest in the hereditary revenues of the Crown; but he did not on that account give up his interest in the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster; on the contrary, he expressly retained them, and in his Speech to Parliament in 1820, he said—"The first object to which your attention will be directed is, the provision to be made for the support of the Civil Government, and of the honour and dignity of the Crown—I leave entirely at your disposal my interest in the Hereditary Revenues." George 4th did not, nor did he mean to relinquish the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster, and nobody supposed that he did mean it; therefore, it is not the gross ignorance of his Majesty's Government that is to be complained of; but the gross ignorance of the hon. and learned Gentleman, which has led him to make the unfounded accusation. George the 3rd also in his Speech resigned his interest in the hereditary revenue; but he retained his interest in the hereditary revenue of the Duchy of Lancaster. The Speech, therefore, of his present Majesty, is in exact conformity with the Speeches of his predecessors, George 3rd and George 4th; and I contend with confidence, that the present Government are not chargeable with the gross ignorance, which belongs only to the hon. and learned Member. But it seems that the terms "casual revenues" imply the relinquishment of the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster."

Mr. *Brougham*: I contend that the words of the Speech imply everything.

Sir *R. Peel*: And I contend that they do not. I suppose, that, as a lawyer, the hon. Gent. will not deny that the construction of particular phrases is to be collected from Acts of the Legislature, and I refer him to the language of the Statute 1 George 4th, to establish that it was never intended that the accounts of the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster should annually be laid before Parliament, like the accounts of the surplus revenues of Gibraltar, &c. which it was provided should be presented before the 24th March in each year. Here, then, is an Act of the Legislature, giving an express construction to the words "casual revenues;" and I think I have shewn that these words cannot be held to apply to the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster. I contend, therefore, confidently that his Majesty's Ministers cannot be justly charged with gross ignorance and stupidity for not including those revenues in words to which former Speeches and Acts of Parliament have given a definite meaning, excluding those revenues. It will be more convenient on a future occasion to discuss the proposition of the noble Lord for a Select Committee; though neither he nor the hon. and learned Member seems to have made up his mind whether that committee shall have power only to examine accounts, or to send for persons, papers, and records; but let me tell them that the distinction is most material. The whole speech of the hon. member for Middlesex shows that he would not be satisfied unless the committee had power to investigate the necessity of the most minute items of expenditure; nor do I see, whatever object the noble Lord may have in view, how that could be otherwise answered, I beg to state, however, that at no period has Parliament yet thought fit to appoint a committee with such extensive powers to inquire into the Civil List; though I will reserve until the proper occasion my objections to the nomination of a committee, now first proposed, to examine every particular connected with the Royal Household, and the maintenance of the dignity of the Crown. I hold in my hand a statement of the amount of every bill for the last ten years, and it has been prepared in order that the House may be able to compare the estimate of the present year with the expenditure of the past. If, however, the House of Commons deems it consistent with propriety to ascertain whether it was fit, in every instance, that the money laid out should have been so expended, all I can say is, that such a course will spare the King's servants some labour; but I do not think it is well calculated to uphold the dignity of the Monarchy. There is no instance of the appointment of such a committee, excepting where a debt was incurred by the Civil List, and where resort was had to Parliament for the payment of it. It seems to me that the accounts already produced, and those that will be laid upon the Table this evening, contain so full an explanation of every item of charge, that I cannot believe the House will not be as competent to form its judgment upon every point on which its judgment will be required, as if a committee were to be named, with the limitations imposed on former committees on the same subject. On this question the House cannot possibly decide until it sees all the documents; but this I may say, that the King's Government would have been justly chargeable with an attempt to throw the responsibility of the settlement of the Civil List on the House of Commons, if it had not itself proposed the estimate of what it thought consistent with public economy, and a due regard to the comfort and dignity of the Throne. I apprehend that the House will feel that we have pursued a course both accordant with propriety and conformable to ancient usage. The hon. and learned Gentleman complains of the complexity of the accounts. Now, I cannot see how the accounts could be simplified by merely transferring some particular items from one account to another. Any man of sense, who will take the trouble of reading the Act of Parliament, will understand that those expenses have no connection with the personal expenditure of the Sovereign. It may be right or it may be wrong to include them in the Civil List; but I, for my part, cannot understand how their omission could serve in the least to simplify the accounts. The hon. and learned Gentleman says, that it is not fair to the monarchy to include in the Civil List expenses which are incurred for the public service, and not for the personal comfort of the Sovereign, or for the dignity of the Crown. But, Sir, for my part, I think it by no means expedient to separate the personal expenses of the Monarch from every other expense. Such an arrangement, at least, would be contrary to that which has been hitherto adopted, and which met the assent of Mr. Fox, and of many other eminent men who were usually opposed to the Ministers of their day, and equally alive to preserving the welfare and independence of the people, and the dignity of the Crown. It never before has been suggested that there exists any necessity to make a separation of those articles of expenditure which are applied to the maintenance of the splendor of the Crown from those which are applied to the service of the State. I am sure, Sir, that no arrangement could be made, of which mischievous and artful persons could not take advantage for the purpose of inflaming the minds of the ignorant and thoughtless. Look to the hand-bills which some designing persons have found means to circulate extensively, representing the Marquis of Bute to receive vast sums of the public money, while the truth is, that nobleman has never received from the public one farthing. The name of the noble Marquis is placed at the head of a list of persons who are described as receiving immense sums from the taxes. Now, Sir, I know that great dissatisfaction has been excited among the least informed of the people by those gross misrepresentations. But by what arrangements shall we be able to prevent mischievous men from making such statements, and ignorant and foolish men from believing them? Now in what respect is confusion occasioned by the present arrangement? and in what degree would simplification be effected by setting aside, in a separate account from every other branch of the public expenditure, 400,000*l.* or 500,000*l.*, or whatever sum Parliament may see fit to allow, for the personal expenses of the Crown? The impression on my mind is, that such an arrangement would be, for many reasons, inexpedient. And so far as public economy is concerned, it is of no consequence whatever upon what fund those other expenses (now included in the Civil List) are charged; for there is an express provision, that should any saving be effected in them, the sum saved shall not go into the Privy Purse, but shall be transferred to the Exchequer. As regards public economy, therefore, I say, Sir, there is no difference whether those expenses be placed in this account or in that. But further, Sir, as to this sum of 400,000*l.* or 500,000*l.*, which is said to be voted for the personal comfort of his Majesty, I deny that it is intended to contribute to his personal comfort. It is voted to enable him to maintain that splendour, the maintenance of which is inseparably connected, not with the personal comforts of the King, but with the public interest. Is the office of the Lord High Steward, or of the Lord Chamberlain, or any other of the officers of the household, institututed for the personal comfort of the Sovereign? Certainly not. There are connecting links between the Throne and the aristocracy, and unite together the separate bodies which, without some such connection and mutual dependence might come into hostility and conflict. They are subservient to that dignity which the Sovereign should uphold for the honour and interest of the nation, and which he sometimes upholds with great inconvenience to himself. Therefore, Sir, I doubt whether it be expedient to make an entire separation of the expense of every public office from the Civil List, and to hold out to the people in a separate sum, the charge which they pay for the monarchy. I say it is a question rather of feeling, or at most of expediency, than of public economy. I believe that every man of intelligence in the kingdom is aware, that the Civil List does not merely include the personal expenses of the Monarch, but that it also provides for other branches of the public service. I cannot suppose that we should either dispel illusion or give satisfaction by the separation proposed. Even the advantages which are represented as likely to be attained by that arrangement do not seem to me of such importance as to counterbalance the inconveniences which would result from it. However, as this seems to me to be a question for the consideration of the committee—whether it be a mere Committee of Supply, or a committee of more extended powers, such as the noble Lord (Althorp) has proposed, for that opportunity I shall reserve the further explanation of my view of this question.

Mr. *Brougham* said, that he not only forgave the right hon. Baronet for the charge which he had brought against him, but he also thanked him for having kept him (Mr. Brougham) to hear what he certainly had never heard before. He would not say that he was not grossly ignorant, but he was then, at least, less ignorant than he had been before that evening. Until then he had not known that there was any man who supposed that such a charge could be made against him. The right hon. Baronet, however, had charged him with ignorance—not respecting anything of which he (Mr. Brougham) had spoken, but respecting that to which he had not made the most distant allusion. He would ask, did any hon. Member hear him allude to the speeches of former Kings? yet the hon. Baronet had produced two Kings' Speeches to convict him of gross ignorance—ignorance of what?—of Kings' Speeches. He (Mr. Brougham) had complained of the phrase "without reserve," which occurs in the last Speech from the Throne; and the right hon. Baronet had endeavoured, in his speech, to show that the phrase "without reserve," in that speech, was used in the same meaning as the word "entirely" in the Speech of a former King. He (Mr. Brougham) knew well, that when the late King, in his Speech in 1820, placed the hereditary revenues of the Crown at the disposal of that House, those of the Duchy of Lancaster and of the Duchy of Cornwall were reserved from that surrender. But what misled him (Mr. Brougham) and other lawyers, in respect to the meaning of the Speech with which the present Session was opened, was this: When Ministers came down to the House, and said in the name of the Crown, that his Majesty placed at the disposal of the House, "without reserve," his interest in the hereditary revenues, and in those funds which may be derived from his Droits of the Admiralty, &c. &c. or from any casual revenues, either in his foreign possessions, or in the United Kingdom—when he and many others heard that, they could not suppose that anything else was meant but that his Majesty gave up those revenues unlimitedly and without that reservation of the revenues of the Duchies which had been made on the occasions referred to by the right hon. Baronet. Now, he would ask what pains had there not been taken to keep them in that error? Was that declaration in the Speech received like those of former Speeches? Did not he (Mr. Brougham) say in his remarks upon that Speech, that he stood up to discharge a pleasing office, in expressing his heartfelt satisfaction that his Majesty had tendered, unhesitatingly, not only his other hereditary revenues, but also those which he derived from Cornwall and Lancaster, and which the Crown had formerly been so loth to relinquish? But, good God! he would ask, was the surrender, which had been so much praised for its unreservedness and for the economy of purpose which it implied; was that surrender, after all, only the same as that made by a former King, whom nobody ever praised for economy, except, indeed, the Chancellor of the Exchequer? That King's reign might be characterised by some, as happy and prosperous and peaceful, and what not; but if the English language contained one word more inapplicable than another to that reign, it was the word economical. But when the Ministers saw him (Mr. Brougham) and others strain their throats in the praises of the present King, for the unlimitedness of his surrender of those revenues, why did not somebody stand up and say "Don't be too thankful for small mercies. Wait, simpletons, until you see what you are going to get?" Far from that; when he (Mr. Brougham) expressed his gratitude for the surrender of the resources of the Duchy of Lancaster, there were in the House, besides the Ministers who had spoken, three Cabinet Ministers in reserve. Amongst them was the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was then prepared with his plan of "no surrender" and with all his plans of reform. Why, he would ask, did not that right hon. Gentleman stand up and say:—"Pooh, pooh! you poor deluded fool!—why do you waste your gratitude? There is no Lancaster nor Cornwall either to be given up." No, no. Not one of the right hon. Gentlemen opened even a corner of his mouth to correct the mistake. But when they saw that the Speech had led him into error, they left him and the House under the delusion until that night, when the speech of the right hon. Gentleman came to disappoint their just expectations. He was not prepared to say what ought to be the powers of the committee to which the question of the Civil List was to be referred. He would not say that it ought to be such as never before was appointed—namely, with instructions to call before it the scullions of the royal kitchen, and the lowest menials of the household, as to items of the King's expenditure; but he was prepared to say, that there ought to be a committee instructed to inquire rigidly into those other expenses so improperly mixed up with the Civil List. With respect to the misrepresentation concerning the Marquis of Bute, he (Mr. Brougham) marvelled much at the inadvertency of the right hon. Baronet in not perceiving how much the case of the noble Marquis operates against his own argument. That nobleman is Lord Lieutenant of the country of Glamorgan. Now if it were found that in the accounts of that county all the expenses of its administration were set down to the name of the Marquis, would not such a discovery explain the pretences upon which the statements of the calumnious handbill are founded? And was it not to prevent a similar mis-statement respecting the expenses of the King, that the separation of other expenses from the Civil List had been proposed? As to what the right hon. Baronet had stated respecting the assent of Mr. Fox to the arrangements adhered to by the Ministry, he (Mr. Brougham) did not know whether that great statesman had or had not given such an arrangement his sanction. But this he knew, that Mr. Fox was but twelve years old when the settlement of the Civil List was proposed in the reign in which he (Mr. Fox) took part in public affairs. Of what weight his opinions on such a subject could have been at that age, he was unable to say, and he also knew that Mr. Fox was dead more than twelve years before the settlement of the Civil List in the last reign. Why his venerated name had been introduced on the present occasion, he could not understand; perhaps Mr. Fox did at some time or other say something in which he might be supposed to approve of the management; and if the Members were informed of his opinion, no doubt it would have considerable weight with them.

Sir *R. Peel* said, that when the hon.

and learned Member affirmed that a charge had been made against him, he seemed to forget that he had put them (the Ministers) upon their defence, and that no charge had been brought against the hon. and learned Member by him (Sir R. Peel), except in retort for a charge previously brought against himself. He had certainly dwelt upon one expression used by the learned Gentleman, in which he had charged the Ministers with gross ignorance. Throughout that discussion he had been altogether right, and the hon. and learned Gentleman altogether wrong, notwithstanding the ingenuity with which he had endeavoured to support his construction of the passage in the King's Speech alluded to. The revenues of the Duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall were never, he contended, understood to be comprehended in the phrase "hereditary revenues of the Crown." In surrendering the hereditary revenues of the Crown to the disposal of that House, his late Majesty King George 4th, had used the expression, that he surrendered them "entirely," and his present Majesty had said the same thing in other words—namely, that he surrendered those revenues "without reserve." The difference was only in the phraseology—there was no difference of meaning. The words of his Majesty's Speech were these:—"I place, without reserve, at your disposal, my interest in the hereditary revenues, and in those funds which may be derived from any Droits of the Crown or Admiralty, from the West-India duties," &c. &c. Now, he would ask if it were not clear that his Majesty would have enumerated the revenues of the Duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall amongst the others, had he purposed to surrender them [*no, no!*]? As to the statement that Mr. Fox was only twelve years old when the question of the Civil List was discussed, the fact was, that Mr. Fox was in Parliament when Mr. Burke brought forward the act by which the Civil List was divided into the different classes of expenditure which it contains at present; and when that bill was before the House, Mr. Fox did not dissent from the arrangement. The hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Brougham) asked why the Ministers did not correct the mistake respecting the revenues of the Duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall. On the second evening he (Sir R. Peel) heard that mistake corrected by his right hon. friend near him. If the hon. and learned Gentleman was not in the House on that occasion, perhaps he was attending to his duties elsewhere; but he (Sir R. Peel) was in the House, attending to his duty, when the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. D. W. Harvey) asked whether the revenues of the Duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall, were included in the surrender, and it was distinctly answered that they were not.

Mr. *Brougham* observed, that he had not been set right on the night before.

The *Attorney-General* was sure that when his learned friend opposite (Mr. Brougham) considered what long speeches he was in the habit of making, he would not quarrel with him (the Attorney-General) for not remembering every thing that he (Mr. Brougham) might say there, and in other places, where he (the Attorney-General) had the pleasure of meeting him. Had he (the Attorney-General) supposed for a moment that his learned friend, or any other lawyer, could fall into the error of considering the Revenues of the Duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall included in the expression, "the Hereditary Revenues of the Crown," he (Sir J. Scarlett) would have immediately set him right.

Lord *James Stuart* was glad that allusion had been made to certain placards, in which it was mentioned that a noble relative of his was in the receipt of a sum of public money, to the amount of 62,000*l.* a-year, as it gave him an opportunity of utterly denying, in his place in the House, the statement on the placard. He begged to tell the honourable Committee that his hon. relative, (the Marquis of Bute), never received one single farthing from the public during the last sixteen years in which he had been in possession of his estate. As very considerable circulation had been given to the placard, and as it had been quoted in various newspapers of great respectability and great circulation, he felt that the Committee would excuse him in making the statement. He could not imagine who it was, or what class of persons, thought fit to indulge in such gross and infamous falsehoods, but he was sure every Gentleman in the House, and every man out of doors, would take pleasure in contradicting these assertions. The placard alluded to was extracted from a publication of some years back, entitled "a Peep at the Peers." He knew this publication to be full of gross and infamous falsehoods, not only as regarded his brother, but other persons.

Lord *Palmerston* considered, that the observations of his right hon. friend (Sir R. Peel) only further proved the unfortunate choice of topics which the King's Speech exhibited. He had heard it said of some person, as a great proof of ability, that he could speak off a King's Speech without preparation. And certainly, until he heard the Speech with which the present Session had been opened, he did not think that there was any great display of talent in such an exploit. But when he knew that eleven Statesmen had been employed in the production of the Speech so often alluded to in the discussion of that evening, he was enabled to appreciate the merit of the man who could compose a King's Speech without assistance or premeditation. For his own part, he (Lord Palmerston) knew that there were a great number in that House who had supposed the revenues of the Duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall to be included in the revenues which his Majesty placed at the disposal of the House. He thought it would have been better for the Ministers (as some of them must have been aware of the general impression respecting that matter) to have come forward to correct the error, instead of relying upon an explanation of technicalities for their excuse. He would not then go into the details of the arrangements which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had that evening explained, for, on so short a consideration as he had been able to give the subject, it was impossible to make up his mind respecting it. But he saw with regret that the Government was not convinced of the propriety of a more simplified arrangement. In the arguments alleged by his right hon. friend (Sir R. Peel), he did not see any satisfactory grounds for adhering to the present arrangement. His right hon. friend denied that the change recommended was of any importance in regard to public economy; but he (Lord Palmerston) was of opinion, that when the expenses of the Civil List were to be settled for the whole reign, it must be of great importance indeed to public economy that the accounts should be considered fully; which he did not think could be done if the expenses were not brought forward under different heads. His right hon. friend expressed doubts whether it would be for the real interest of the Crown that the personal expenses of the Monarch should be placed in a separate account from the other domestic expenses of the State, and he seemed to think that something was gained to the credit of the Crown by its personal expenses being hidden amongst numerous other charges. But no advantage, he was sure, could be gained by an arrangement in which the real state of the facts was kept out of sight. He believed that there was in the House and in the country every disposition to contribute to the maintenance of the dignity of the Crown with the splendor suited to that form of Government under which the country enjoyed so many advantages, and to which he was convinced the people were devotedly attached. In those estimates the personal expenses of the Crown ought to be separated from others which have no more connexion with them than any expenses which are brought before the House in a different manner. The result was, that when the House was called on to give 800,000*l.* or 900,000*l.* for the support of the Civil List, and any hon. Member objected that such a sum was too great, the Ministers turned round and replied that only one-half of that sum was really appropriated to the expenses of the Crown. The only advantage that Ministers could expect to derive from such an arrangement was, to keep the House from understanding the true state of the expenditure. He quite agreed with his right hon. friend, that it was not desirable that the House should go into minute inquiries as to details of the expenses necessary for the personal comforts of the Sovereign. Such inquiries would be revolting to the country, and were not desired by the House; and he was sure that had the Government set down in the Civil List only those expenses, to the investigation of which that strong objection could apply, the discussion of that evening would not have arisen. But of the contents of that List there was more than one-half, to the examination of which such an objection could not be applied. He was perfectly sure that, when they came to the details of that List, whether they should do so in a Committee up-stairs or in that House, there would be in all but one desire—to look with vigilance to all other expenses whatever, at the same time that they should allow the Sovereign all that could be necessary to support his dignity with the splendor becoming his Majesty and the nation.

Sir *H. Parnell* took that opportunity of saying, that although he had no desire to raise unnecessary obstructions in the way of the public business, he should feel it his duty (when the question of the Civil List should be brought forward on Monday) to move that it be referred to a Select Committee to inquire into the particulars of the Expenditure.

Chairman to report progress, and Committee to sit again on Monday.

West Indian Trade with America.] On the Motion of Mr. Herries the report on the Bill regulating the trade of America with British possessions was brought up.

Mr. *Whitmore* said, that by this Bill, the old principle of protection, which he had hoped had been exploded, was renewed. When he looked at the duties on articles imported from North America and the United States, he saw clearly what the object and intention was. He could not look at this as at all a measure of policy, inasmuch as the effect would be to give a misdirection to capital—to raise up certain interests which ought to be left to their own resources, and which, on some future occasion, we should again be called upon to protect. All these duties were for the benefit of the West-Indies, but opportunities would occur for their consideration at a future period. The whole system was one of error, which ought not to be perpetuated, as it would ever afford a strong ground of objection. The entire Colonial system required the most minute attention, as there was nothing more productive of expense, exclusive of the shackles it imposed upon commerce. He would not then occupy the time of the House further, but he must enter his protest against the whole proceeding.

The Resolutions were read, and on the question that the first Resolution be read a second time,

Mr. *Keith Douglas* contended, that the present schedule bestowed no boon upon the West-India interests, for that, before 1825, the trade between the Colonies and America was not incumbered with any duty, and the Colonies would not be better off now than before that year. In fact, the duties laid on by Lord Goderich were less than those now proposed. In justice to the colonists, some protection ought to be afforded to the West Indies, which were subject to duties, not for their benefit, but for the benefit of the Crown, and they were imposed just as suited the political views of the mother country. Justice should be done to all parties, and without due protection to the West Indies gross injustice would be rendered.

Mr. *Warburton* observed, that scarcely had his hon. friend uttered his prediction, relative to the West-Indies, than it was fulfilled by the Representative of that interest who had just spoken. He, however, in the name of the people of England, must protest against any duty upon sugar, which was an article of the first necessity. Were the West-India interest not satisfied with protecting duties to the amount of a million and a half, but they must require fresh imposts in addition? The Colonies were most expensive encumbrances, and there was no end to the outlay required in their favour, for, in addition to all these duties, they would have fortifications, canals, &c. to provide for.

Mr. *Jephson* also protested against the present Colonial system.

Mr. *Herries* said, that he did not consider it necessary to go again over the ground which he had so recently passed, by repeating the remarks which, on the introduction of the measure, he felt it his duty to offer to the House. The proposed schedule had been treated, although it contained a plan more liberal than had previously existed, as if it were a departure from the principles of what was usually termed free-trade. The only objection he had heard to it related to the principle of the Bill; and if he rightly comprehended the objection, the measure had been as completely misunderstood, as could well be conceived. It had been stated, that the schedule now introduced by Government, was an innovation on the recognised system. Such was not the case. The object of the measure was not to impose, for the first time, the duties which the schedule contained. It was the sequence of an amicable termination to a long controversy; and the arrangement had been concluded on terms which involved no departure from those principles (either in respect of our trade, or of our colonial possessions) which his Majesty's Government professed. The Ministers had not acted in opposition to the abstract principles of free-trade, but they were not bound to follow them so closely as to lead to consequences of an injurious character. He knew nothing so dangerous as that sort of philosophy which called for the unqualified adoption of those principles, If he were accused of not acting up to general abstract principles, to that accusation he pleaded guilty. Abstract principles might be good in themselves, but nothing was more likely to plunge a country into danger and difficulty than to legislate on them without reference to the state and relations of the country. It was the duty of every statesman, however unexceptionable such principles might be, to regulate the application of them according to circumstances, and not, as was to be inferred from the hon. member for Bridport's doctrine, that circumstances, and expediency, and regard to long-established usages and interests, were all to be overlooked, or forced to bend in obedience to abstract principles. The general rule which his predecessors in office had acted upon, and which he purposed following, had been gradually to relax protecting duties; a rule to be departed from only when a departure should appear advantageous to the country. In 1822, Lord Goderich, then President of the Board of Trade, for the first time deviated from the ancient system, and laid down a new plan, by which our trade was thrown open, under certain restrictions. It was not then, nor could it justly be pretended now, that we ought to proceed upon principles adverse to separate interests, and embracing the good of the whole human race. The inhabitants of the earth did not yet form one family; and so long as they remained distinct nations, each pursuing its separate and independent interest, so long would it be the duty of the Legislature and Government of this country to refuse to foreign nations, the privileges of trading with our colonies upon the same terms as ourselves. He wished, however, to guard himself from its being understood that he desired to depart from those abstract principles of free-trade, any further than was demanded by a fair and rational attention to circumstances of present expediency. He was for affording all the relaxation that could safely be granted; and it was only when concession became dangerous, that he would stop short. Hon. Members were in error when they supposed that the schedule of duties was framed with a view to benefit the West-India interest, or any other interest than that of the empire at large. It was the result, as he had, on a former occasion explained, of the very satisfactory conclusion of a long and difficult controversy, involving many disputed points between this country and the United States, and it did not propose to effect more than to open the trade of our West-India colonies to America. Concessions had been made by the United States, which previously had been refused, and a participation in the trade of our western colonies had been granted them, under certain restrictions. Those concessions we were bound to carry into effect, by some such plan as that which he had introduced to the House. Under the restrictions laid down in this Bill, our northern colonies and the United States were permitted to trade with the West-Indies. It was no innovation on our commercial policy, the principle being, as nearly as possible, the same, deviating only according to existing circumstances, as that established by Lord Goderich, in 1822, and confirmed by the late Mr. Huskisson, whose name must be allowed to be an authority in such matters, in 1825. The conduct of the American government in refusing the terms offered to them in that year, compelled the British Government to issue the order which prohibited a direct communication between the United States and the West-Indies. The direct intercourse between the two countries was thus broken off, while, by the Act of 1825, the circuitous intercourse was established. After a lapse of time, circumstances indeed arose, which induced a hope that the line of conduct which had been adopted by the American government would be changed; but if the Government had suffered the interests of its colonies to have been again injured, it would not have acted with that strict regard to the welfare of the people in favour of which it had always manifested a strong disposition. After all the arguments he had heard, and after all the attention he had been able to bestow upon the subject, he did not think that a more beneficial course could have been selected. It had been said, that it should be the endeavour of the Government, when it imposed a tax, that such tax should yield a benefit to the country. That was the principle the Government was endeavouring in this case to act upon. The advantage apparently given to the United States was not meant for them alone, but would be divided with this country. His hon. friend who appeared as the Representative for the West-India interest, had only alluded to a few articles in the schedule, by which he thought the West-India interest would be injured; but whilst he carefully pointed out the part calculated to create a slight diminution of gain, he forgot the advantages that would be derived from the other parts of the schedule. The hon. member for Bridport had questioned the mark of favour which, he said, had been given to the West-India proprietors. He must beg leave not to make that a question of debate at present, as the time for the discussion of the sugar-duties would arrive in due season. But if the House were to deal with the Canadians by the rule which some hon. Members laid down, changing the favoured position in which they now stood, they would immediately say, "Oh, you are breaking through your promise." In his opinion, the measure adopted would most conduce to a general advantage; for when duties were imposed, the probability was, that the Minister who did not please either of two parties, had selected that which would prove the best. The advantages promised by the present arrangement to both countries, would no doubt be considerable, and therefore he trusted that the House would concur in the resolution.

Sir *Henry Parnell* said, he felt it right to raise his voice against the principle of the right hon. Gentleman's measure. He could not view it in any other light than as a revival of a system prejudicial to the country. The country was loaded with protecting duties on protecting duties, and monopolies on monopolies, and distressed, by the millions of money taken out of the pockets of the people, and he could not but feel it to be his duty to take steps to prevent as far as was in his power, the Minister from departing from those principles of commercial policy, which led to the abrogation of monopoly and protecting duties. The right hon. Gentleman called upon the House to retrace its steps with regard to free-trade; and to do what? Why, actually to impose a tax on the raw materials of industry. Was that the way the right hon. Gentleman proposed to carry into practical effect the great guiding principle which the House was bound to maintain—the interest of the empire at large? From the schedule before the House, it appeared that an additional duty was to be imposed on raw materials entering the West-Indies; and as a consequence, the cost of the production of sugar, the West-Indian staple commodity, would be increased, and that increase must act either as a diminution of the planter's profits, or raise the price of sugar to the consumer: the latter would, as the House knew, be the actual effect. On either supposition, could the right hon. Gentleman pretend to say, that the interest of the public at large was consulted? The whole measure of the right hon. Gentleman was so objectionable, that he would move, by way of amendment to its principle, that the duty on flour be omitted. That was not the only objectionable point in the right hon. Gentleman's proposition; but he fixed on it as a ready mode of marking disapprobation of the principles of commercial policy to which Ministers were attempting to induce the House to retrograde. He hoped the House would persevere in the policy on which it had hitherto acted, and diminish the protecting duties. The right hon. Gentleman appeared not to know what the real principle of the policy of this country should be. He would beg leave to tell him, that if he proposed to make a change in our commercial policy, that it would be attended with the most prejudicial consequences. The Legislature should do that which alone was for the benefit of the country, and the measure of the right hon. Gentleman would produce a different effect. It would most certainly sacrifice the commercial interest of this country. It was going back to a system which science, and philosophy, and practical good sense, had united to condemn and get rid of. It was clearly prohibitory, and he would make every endeavour to oppose it. Not only was it objectionable in principle, in practice it would also operate as a tax on the price of various articles brought from our other colonies to the West-Indies. The right hon. Gentleman had adopted a great error concerning our colonial policy. If any attempt were made on the renewal of the East-India Charter, for the reduction of the duty on East-India sugar, it would be met by the observation, that the West-Indians could not afford to sell their sugar so cheap, because the American corn and flour, with which they feed their slaves, were taxed by Government. It was under the expectation that these taxes would be soon reduced, that the House consented to the protecting duties of 1825, and it was in consequence of the foolish conduct of our own Government, that the intercourse between the United States and our West-Indian colonies had been cut off. It appeared from a paper printed last year, that for an average number of years previous to the American Non-intercourse Act, the West-Indian colonies were yearly in the habit of exporting to the United States 24,000 hogsheads of sugar, 18,900 puncheons of rum, 1,200,000 lbs. of coffee, and 2,400,000 lbs. of molasses. The produce of these colonies, sent indirectly to the United States, was now comparatively trifling. The measures, therefore, of the Government almost annihilated the intercourse between the West-Indian Islands and the United States. The Ministers in the first instance, compelled the Americans to levy duties on our commodities; and when Ministers attempted to retaliate, they destroyed our own trade. He would remind the House that the duties on the import of American articles into the West-Indian colonies caused the United States to increase the amount of the duties in their tariff. The House would not do its duty to the country if it did not compel Ministers to abandon this measure, and in the hope that it would, he should persist in his Amendment, being also persuaded that the measure of the right hon. Gentleman would be injurious both to the colonies and the mother country, and would add to the general dissatisfaction.

Mr. *Courtenay* said, it was in the full recollection of the observation, that he who commences with asserting a principle generally concludes with supporting an exception, that he declaring himself an advocate of free-trade, stood up in support of the measure before the House. The principle on which it was founded was in perfect accordance with the principles of commercial policy pursued for the last few years by this country. The hon. Baronet treated the present measure as if it consisted in increasing the protecting duties from a low to a high rate. But what were the circumstances of the case? At present there was a state of positive prohibition, and it was proposed, in the place of this system, to adopt, in the first instance, a scale of high protecting duties, which it would be possible to lower as circumstances required. Nothing would induce him to support the permanent imposition of protecting duties in any branch of trade or manufacture; but he defended this measure, because a transition from a state of prohibition to one of freedom ought to be gradual. The adoption of protecting duties was for a time necessary for the protection of those interests which had grown up under a state of prohibition. He had formerly said in the House, that the advocates of free-trade did not make sufficient allowance for effecting this transition. Under the prohibition, interests grew up which it would not be consistent with justice suddenly to abandon. The hon. Baronet must surely be aware of the great advances made in our North American colonies, by the commercial and shipping interests, in internal prosperity; which were to be attributed principally to the cessation of the intercourse with the United States. The transition from a state of prohibition to one of perfect freedom, would lead to the immediate destruction of the interests of our North American colonies, which the duties imposed by this measure were calculated to avert. The measure would also be beneficial to the West-India colonies, by carrying the produce of our northern colonies to compete with that of the United States in their markets. The State had also been benefitted by the exertions made by the northern colonies to furnish the West-Indies, as they had enabled us to say to the Americans, "We are perfectly independent of you, and are perfectly able to supply our own colonies without your assistance." The hon. Baronet stated, that the present scale of duties was higher than the former, but he forgot that the circumstances under which they were imposed were very different from the present. The principles now acted on were adopted by previous Governments of 1822 and 1825. He would read an extract from a speech delivered by Lord Goderich, who was then at the head of the department to which he belonged. That noble Lord said, in a speech delivered April 1st, 1822,—"Every one knows that the staple articles of produce in the latter are similar to those of the United States; and recent circumstances, arising out of our restrictions on the one hand, and retaliatory restrictions by the United States on the other, have led to a much more extended import of corn, flour, and lumber from Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, than otherwise would have taken place. This trade will necessarily be more or less affected by the proposed changes; and I confess that I do feel that our North American colonists have strong claims upon us for a favourable consideration of their peculiar interests. Speaking the same language, living under the same laws as ourselves, distinguished by the same characteristic traits as their European brethren, they have secured, by their attachment to their mother-country, a title to her gratitude and protection. That protection can, in this instance, be afforded to them in no other way than by imposing a moderate duty upon the importation into the West-Indies of those foreign articles, such as grain, flour, and lumber, which are equally the production of our own dominions. I shall not now trouble the Committee by going into any details upon this part of the subject, further than to state, that the duties should be so moderately calculated, and so justly apportioned, as not to deprive the people of the United States of their fair proportion of this necessary supply, or seriously to enhance the price to the consumer."* The present measure was not in opposition to the opinions and conduct of Mr. Huskisson, when President of the Board of Trade. Among the papers of that office he had lately found a valuable minute, which he would read to the House, and from which it would appear that the present measure was not opposed to the system recommended by him. "Our general and first principle is to tender to all nations, alike and indiscriminately, equal facilities of commerce and navigation, and equal inducements to visit the ports of this country with their merchandise, either for our own consumption, or in the way of transit *(entrepôt)* to other parts of the world. In furtherance of this principle (with the single exception of wine from Portugal, under a specific and very ancient treaty), we have proceeded: first, to abolish all discriminating duties affecting differently the like productions of foreign countries, and, in lieu thereof, to establish one uniform tariff for the whole; secondly, to reduce that tariff to the lowest degree consistent in each particular article with the two legitimate objects of all duties; either the collection of the necessary public revenue, or the protection absolutely requisite for the maintenance of our own internal industry." He must observe, that the protecting duties now substituted for prohibition, were not to be considered as permanent, but might be reduced from time to time, as the interests of the country required, or as circumstances rendered necessary. There were some articles of supply to the West-Indies admitted free of all duty, because they were not furnished by or through our northern colonies. On the whole he was satisfied, advocate as he was for freedom of trade, that he ought to support the present resolution.

Mr. *Hume* was at a loss to understand the observations of the right hon. Gentleman, who stated that he was a supporter of the principles of free-trade, and at the same time argued in favour of a system of protecting duties. The measure would add to the price of every article imported into our colonies from either the Canadas or the United States, and would not be of the least benefit to any one. So far from being a benefit to the West-Indian colonies, it would be a great curse, as it would materially increase the price of their food, and Great Britain would have to pay an increased sum for the sugar and for every article imported into this country from the West-Indies. If the right hon. Gentleman really wished to have a scale of duties which might be gradually reduced, he should have commenced at a duty of 5*s.* a barrel on American flour, instead of 6*s.*, as he had proposed. The right hon. Gentleman called himself an advocate for the principles of free-trade, and what was his measure? Why, to increase the protecting duty on American flour from 5*s.* to 6*s.* a barrel, and to increase the duty on shingles from 6*s.* to 10*s.* a thousand. When the time came for taking the East-Indian duties into consideration, this protecting duty would be urged as an argument against the reduction of them. The American tariff was entirely the consequence of the conduct of Government. A right hon. Gentleman attempted to bully the Americans, but found himself mistaken, and the Government had now been glad to admit them into the trade again on nearly the former terms. The most judicious policy for this country, would be, to diminish duties gradually, until at last it might be expedient to establish an unrestricted intercourse. The Americans were enabled to sell timber and shingles to our West-Indian colonists, at a much lower rate than the people of our North American colonies; and it was a folly to put duties on for a purpose which never could be attained; namely, entirely to exclude articles of American produce from our colonies. As a matter of course, whatever tax was imposed on a commodity must fall upon the consumer. Thus we should have to pay, in the increased price of our sugar, the whole amount of the duty of the right hon. Gentleman. The House was entitled to ask two things of his Majesty's Government. In the first place, that the duty on American flour should not be higher than it was before; and, in the second place, that the amount of duty should decrease one-fourth every year, until the whole was extinct, when the trade might be thrown open. Unless Ministers would consent to some modification of this kind, when the Bill went into a committee he should propose that it be restricted to a period of five years. If the people of the North American colonies had embarked capital in judiciously in any concern, they had no right to complain of the Parliament, but of the Government which induced them to enter into speculations, on the faith of keeping up a system and restrictions which never could be maintained; that, however, would not be the first occasion in which the colonists had had reason to complain of the injudicious interference of Ministers. He should support the Amendment of his hon. friend; but he would also most certainly move the Amendment of which he had given notice on the bringing up the Report.

---

* Hansard's Parl. Debates, vol. vi. New Series, p. 1419-20.

Mr. *Robinson* observed, it was not clear to him that those hon. Members were right who advocated what they called the principles of free trade, nor was he satisfied that those who so strenuously argued in favour of that system, understood the subject better than their opponents. It might appear better to the hon. member for Middlesex and the hon. member for Bridgnorth, that these principles should be carried into execution, but he doubted whether the result would be beneficial. At any rate those hon. Members were not justified in arrogating to their side of the question all the good sense of the House. They so eulogized the advocates of free trade, and designated them so repeatedly as enlightened, that it appeared as if they meant to insinuate that all who opposed those principles were ignorant and stupid. The history of past ages would not warrant them in forming such a conclusion. In the United States of America—a country which was, in fact, treading in our footsteps (and it was not improbable that in the course of a few ages, she would attain an eminence and rank among nations equal to any on record) in that country the principle had not been acted upon to the extent stated by hon. Members. Many of the most eminent men of America had been the advocates of restriction; and the hon. member for Bridgnorth must excuse him if he preferred the authority of a Washington, of a Jefferson, a Madison, and a Munro, to his. All these distinguished men advocated the principle of protection to trade, and, in some cases, even of prohibition. Notwithstanding this, there were persons who asserted that the trade of America was free, while that of Great Britain was shackled and restricted. That, however, was not the fact. The Americans, indeed, began with a principle of free trade, but they afterwards adopted a system of protecting duties. He saw no objection to admitting the Americans or other nations to trade with our colonies, but it would be proper to put on a protecting duty in favour of our own commerce, and especially for our shipping interests, as he did not comprehend the use of keeping colonies, and throwing them open to foreign nations to trade on an equal footing. If, however, his opinion could be shown to be wrong, he should be glad to be convinced of his error; but at present he was sincere in supporting the opinion he had announced. The hon. member for Middlesex stated, that he could not approve of the continuance of the protecting duties in favour of the import of our own colonial produce into the West-Indian colonies; but important interests had recently grown up in those colonies, which would be materially injured by a sudden change. He was an advocate for free trade, at least in principle, as well as the hon. Member, but he objected to acting partially on the principle; for until it was established in every instance, including corn, he could not agree to its application to only a few articles. His objection to free trade was, that it was not universal; and as long as that was the case we ought to prefer our own colonies to the United States. The hon. Baronet who was an able advocate of the principle should induce the Government to establish a free-trade in corn. He had read that hon. Baronet's book with considerable satisfaction, but with all possible deference for his talents, he could not think the measures pursued in regulating the intercourse between the United States and our colonies were deserving of the character given of them for they had been attended with great benefit to our shipping interests. The hon. Baronet stated that trade between the United States and our West-

Indian colonies was carried on to a large amount previous to the prohibition, but that it has been almost destroyed in consequence of that. He must observe, however, that the trade was now carried on between our North American and West-Indian colonies, which was formerly carried on between the latter and the United States. If it be contended that the Legislature is bound to look to particular interests, as well as those great principles and effects which may be felt throughout the whole empire—it must be satisfactory to it to know that the shipping interest, one of the most important of the empire had been materially benefitted by these restrictions, and particularly the colonial shipping. Previous to the American Non-intercourse Act, only 36,000 tons of shipping were employed in the trade between the North American and West-Indian colonies; but since the passing of that Act, the average amounted to 90,000. That was an important point for consideration. Since that time, also, the trade of our West-Indian colonies with the mother country had increased to such an important extent, that it was a question of policy whether any alteration should be made. In 1816, the tonnage of the American vessels trading to our West-Indian colonies was 102,000, while that of England engaged in the same trade was 111,349, showing a balance, in favour of England, of 9,000 tons. In the course of a short time, the number of English ships engaged in this trade so declined, that, instead of there being a balance in our favour, there was a falling-off of 13,000 tons, while the tonnage of the American shipping increased to 161,829 tons. Previous to the renewal of the restrictions, the tonnage of the American vessels engaged in this trade exceeded that of the English vessels by 60,000 tons; but subsequent to the restrictions, the colonial shipping had very much increased. It was comparatively of little importance, whether the West-Indian colonies had to pay a shilling or two a thousand more for their shingles, provided so important an interest as that of the shipping could be so materially assisted. The former was a matter of trifling moment, in comparison with the latter. We were bound to protect our colonies as long as we kept them, which we never could do if we placed foreign States on the same footing as ourselves. Mr. Addington, the British minister to the United States, in a letter to Mr. Canning, when Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in 1827, gave it as his opinion, that but for the operation of our prohibitory system, by which American corn was excluded from our market, the high duties would never have been imposed on English commodities. That Gentleman stated that, had it not been for our corn-laws, the Americans would have freely admitted our manufactures into their markets. He was an advocate for a liberal commercial policy, but we ought to commence with the raw material, including corn. He considered the question respecting the scale of duties as of small importance in comparison with finding a market for the produce of our North American colonies. He wished to ask hon. Members whether they thought that, as a trade in timber, &c., to the West-Indian colonies had been commenced from the Canadas and Nova Scotia, and was now in a thriving state, it was likely to continue if the Americans were allowed to compete with our colonists on an equal footing. He doubted if we were prepared to abandon all our colonies, and thought, therefore, that our great object should be to protect and cherish our own colonies and shipping.

Mr. *Herries* explained, that there would be in every sense a diminution of duty. For instance, there was formerly a duty of 1*s.* on flour that came from our northern colonies to the southern.

The schedule having been read a second time,

Sir Henry Parnell moved, that the duty of 1*s.* 2*d.* the bushel imposed on wheat be reduced to 1*s.*

The House divided; for the Amendment 39; Against it 136—Majority 97.

Resolution agreed to and Bill ordered to be brought in.

List of the Minority.

Adeane, H. J.
Althorp, Viscount
Bunbury, Sir H.
Colborne, R.
Chapman, —
Dawson, Alex.
Douglas, Keith
Evans, William
Fergusson, Sir Ronald
Grant, Right Hon. C.
Gisborne, Thomas
Jephson, C. D. O.
Killeen, Lord
Kennedy, T. F.
Lumley, Saville
Leader, N. T.
Lambert, J. S.
Morrison, John
Marshall, William
Malcolm, N.
Martin, John
Marryatt, Joseph
Macnamara, Major
O'Farrell, More

O'Connell, Daniel
Palmer, Fysche
Palmerston, Viscount
Pendarvis, E.
Phillips, G. R.
Rice, Spring
Strutt, Edward
Smith, Vernon
Wayland, —
Warburton, H.
Wyse, Thomas
Wood, John
Whitmore, W.
Wrightson, W. B.
Wynn, Right Hon. C.

TELLERS.

Parnell, Sir H.
Hume, Joseph.*

OATHS OF ABJURATION, &c.] Mr. *C. W. Wynn* thought it would be more convenient, from the nature of this Bill, to postpone the discussion upon it till the next stage. He therefore proposed that it be read a second time, and be committed for Monday se'nnight.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* objected to the total repeal of the Oath of Abjuration, and hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not press that as a necessary part of his measure.

Sir *R. Peel* was disposed to concur in different parts of the bill, but he agreed in the objection of the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down, to the total repeal of the Oath of Abjuration.

Bill read a second time.

SUB-LETTING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.] On the motion of Sir *Henry Hardinge* the Subletting Act (7 Geo. 4. c. 29.) was read. He then observed that after the animated and able discussion the subject had last night received, he should not trespass on the time of the House further than to state, on the part of his Majesty's Government, that it was actuated in bringing forward this bill by no other motive, personal or political, than the strictest wish to act impartially by all parties interested, and to do what was right and proper between the landlords and their tenantry in Ireland. When the bill was printed and laid on the Table, he hopedit would be found to be framed in this spirit, and he invited the assistance and co-operation of all persons interested in the subject to render its enactments in every way suitable to the wants and wishes of the people of Ireland.

Mr. *O'Connell* wished to inquire whether it were intended to introduce any clause to give the landlord power to cancel the lease on account of sub-letting, when the lease itself was silent upon the subject. In the bill of last Session, for mitigating the severity of the Sub-letting Act, there was a clause of this kind, and, if a similar one were inserted in the present bill, he should give it every species of opposition, for it

---

* The following is the Schedule mentioned in the Debate, and the Resolution agreed to by the House.—Resolved:

"That in lieu of the duties now payable, the following duties be levied and charged on certain articles of provisions, and of wood, and of lumber, not being of the growth, or production, or manufacture, of the United Kingdom, nor of any British possession, imported or brought by sea or by inland carriage, or navigation, into the several British possessions in America, viz.

Imported or brought into the British possessions on the Continent of South America, or in the West Indies, the Bahama and Bermuda Islands included, viz.

	£.	s.	d.
Provisions, viz.			
—— Wheat, the bushel	0	1	2
— imported from the Northern Colonies	Duty free		
—— Wheat Flour, the barrel	0	6	0
— imported from the Northern Colonies	Duty free		
—— Bread or biscuit	do.		
—— Flour or meal, not of wheat	do.		
—— Peas, beans, rye, calavances, oats, barley, Indian corn	do.		
—— Rice	do.		
—— Live stock	do.		
Lumber, viz.			
—— Shingles not being more than 12 inches in length, the 1,000	0	10	6
—— — imported from the Northern Colonies	Duty free		
—— — being more than 12 inches in length, the 1,000 ..	1	1	0
—— — imported from the Northern Colonies	Duty free		
—— Staves and headings, the 1,000	0	18	9
—— — imported from the Northern Colonies	Duty free		
—— Wood hoops, the 1,000 ..	0	7	10
—— — imported from the Northern Colonies	Duty free		
—— Other wood and lumber, the 1,000 feet, of 1 inch thick	1	11	6
—— — imported from the Northern Colonies	Duty free		
Imported, or brought into British possessions in North America, viz.			
Provisions, viz.			
—— Wheat flour, the barrel ..	0	5	0
—— may be warehoused without payment of duty, for exportation to the Southern Colonies.			
—— Wheat	Duty free		
—— Bread or biscuit	do.		
—— Flour or meal, not of wheat ..	Duty free		
—— Peas, Beans, rye, calavances, oats, barley, Indian corn	do.		
—— Rice	do.		
—— Live Stock	do.		
Lumber	do.		

would considerably aggravate the mischief it was intended to cure.

Mr. *Doherty* replied, that every consideration had been given to the bill, to accommodate it as far as possible to the views of all parties.

Mr. *Spring Rice* asked if it were the same bill that was brought in last year? [Sir Henry Hardinge replied no.] Then the House could not be aware of its nature. He was against the proposition for repealing the Sub-letting Act, because as far as the principle of binding both parties to their engagements went, it had his entire concurrence; but he also concurred in the necessity of amending the Act, and he would mention two points in which that was requisite. In the first place nothing could be more absurd than the clause respecting devises, which enabled a man, by will, to violate a contract after his death to which he was bound during his lifetime. The other point was the objection, and the only one entitled to a moment's consideration—that the Act had a retrospective effect, although that was a point on which the learned Gentlemen on the two sides of the House were not exactly agreed. As a landlord and a friend to the principle of the bill, he asked no more than that contracts entered into before the passing of the bill should not be affected by it, whilst those made since should come under the operation of the law. There was great weight in the objection made by individuals who had leased property under the law of waiver as it stood before the passing of the new enactment. If these two questions were set at rest, he was convinced that, on all sides, there would be an entire concurrence in the principle of the bill. [Mr. O'Connell intimated his dissent.] From what the hon. and learned Gentleman said the other evening he thought that such would be his opinion. He understood him to say that if all contracts entered into previously to the passing of the bill were left under the former state of law, and to the protection which the tenant had, by the doctrine of waiver, as then interpreted, there could be no possible objection to giving the landlord and tenant the protection of the Sub-letting Act, as to contracts made since it was passed. That was the argument used by the hon. Gentleman the other night, and it would certainly be a fair principle to act upon. The object of this bill had been much misrepresented in Ireland, and misunderstood, even by many of those whose interests were affected by it; but he had consulted some of those with whom he was connected, and they agreed in the vote he gave last night, as well as concurred with him as to the necessity of amending the law. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman opposite had borne these two points in mind in framing this bill. He could not sit down without thanking the Solicitor General for Ireland for the best exposition of the details, and most satisfactory explanation of the principles of that law he had heard.

Mr. *Jephson* was favourable to the principle of the Subletting Act, though he thought amendment was necessary. The attempt made last Session was not at all a successful one; but if the right hon. Gentleman should bring in a fair Bill, his humble assistance should be heartily at his service.

Mr. *Campbell* thought, that the Bill should be so framed as to make it applicable to both parts of the United Kingdom, for the law of England was as defective on this subject as possible. In the time of Elizabeth, a case was argued, called the Tempest case, reported by Lord Coke, in which the Judges came to a decision, not since overturned, under protection of which contracts had been repeatedly evaded, and the intention of the law defeated. If it be stipulated between the landlord and the tenant, that the latter shall not assign without the leave of the former, the law said, that if the landlord once give leave to assign, afterwards the tenant shall have the power of assigning to whom and as often as he pleases. This operated unfavourably to the tenant, because it prevented his landlord from granting him indulgences he might otherwise be inclined to grant. The state of the law had been complained of by that great Judge, Lord Eldon, as well as by many others, and the sooner it was amended the better. He wished, therefore, that the law should be made applicable to both parts of the United Kingdom. It was not intended by it to give any advantage to the landlords of Ireland which those of England did not possess.

Sir *Henry Hardinge* had no doubt that the suggestion of the hon. and learned Gentleman might, with great propriety, be adopted; but he was not sufficiently acquainted with the law of the two countries, to say at present that they ought to be assimilated. With regard to the observations of the hon. member for Limerick, respecting the retrospective effect of this law, it was not intended to make any part of the Bill retrospective; that is to say, that leases waived previous to 1826, by any act done before that period, would not be vitiated; but if the covenant were violated after 1826, the landlord ought to have some protection. He was ready to admit, that the principle ought to be prospective; but there was this to be said in favour of a lease which had not been broken previous to 1826, that the landlord having vigilantly guarded all his interests up to that period, if the tenant afterwards vitiated his lease, the landlord ought to have the benefit of the Subletting Act of 1826. That was his view of the subject; but he admitted that the principle ought to be prospective. With regard to the clause respecting devises, it was to be absolutely repealed, and the exceptions originally put in were to be done away. It was further proposed, that if the landlord did not choose to put a written covenant to restrain his tenant from subletting into the lease, and the tenant should afterwards sublet, the lease shall not be vitiated, as was now the case. The landlord was supposed to be the more intelligent and instructed party, the tenant comparatively ignorant and uninstructed—the one comparatively powerful, the other weak; and, therefore if the Irish gentry wished to protect their lands from the effects of subletting, it would in future be their duty to have a covenant to that effect put into a written lease. That was his view of the subject; but as it was a new one to him he was perhaps incorrect. The object of the Government, in making this amendment of the law, was, to consult no interests but those of fair dealing and justice; and if it could frame a Bill that would do justice between landlord and tenant, its wishes would be attained.

Lord *Althorp* said, that if the law were applied at all to leases existing in 1826, it would have a retrospective effect, and it ought only to operate upon contracts made after the passing of the Act. If that were done, he could not conceive on what principle any man could say an injustice was committed; for it was saying that, two parties entering into a contract, it would be unjust to enforce that contract. All they ought to see to was, that the contract be enforced according to the meaning of the parties at the time they made it; and if at the time they made it a constructive waiver would not have vitiated the lease, so ought it to be, after passing the law, whenever such constructive waiver should occur. He was one of those who thought the Subletting Act a good one; for the want of power on the part of the landlords to enforce the covenants of their leases was the cause of great mischiefs, and therefore he objected to its total repeal.

Mr. *O'Connell* wished to correct a mistake. He did not say that he should disapprove of this law if its operation were to be purely prospective. His objection was, to a law compelling a deviation from a legal contract when made. Prospective contracts, he admitted, were a legitimate subject for legislation, but not contracts already made. If the law were only to operate prospectively, then every man would be put on his guard, and could make such contracts as he wished, and as the law prescribed; but nothing could be more unjust than to make a law giving an effect to existing contracts different from that which they had when first entered into. He had no objection to make the law as strict as possible for the future. The hon. member for Limerick did not seem to understand the Act; and certainly he had not understood his (Mr. O'Connell's) objection to it; which was, that the measure did not allow parties to make contracts as they wished. If the landlord chose to give up his remedy by distress, he might sublet, but not otherwise. The waiver by parole, as it is called, was also taken away. He admitted, that the original contract ought to be strictly performed; but at the same time the landlord ought not to be prevented from underletting. The question he had put had been fully and satisfactorily answered. The spirit, too, in which it had been answered induced him to hope, that when the House came to investigate the details of the measure, it would be able to make it satisfactory to the country. He trusted, however, that it would not be passed in the spirit of a restrictive law.

Lord *Killeen* wished to express his satisfaction that the Bill was not to have a retrospective operation.

Mr. *Ruthven* suggested, that if a man had a large farm, he would require some persons to assist him, and some means should be devised to enable such a person to give his cottier tenants a small portion of land, say an acre or two of garden ground. With reference to what had been said by an hon. and learned Member, it would be only reasonable and satisfactory to the people of Ireland, to know that such a law was not made for them which would not be fit for another country.

Bill ordered to be brought in.

CENSUS FOR IRELAND.] Sir *Henry Hardinge* moved for leave to bring in a Bill for taking an Account of the Population of Ireland. The Bill would be, in substance, the same as the Bill passed for taking an account of the population of Ireland in 1815, the returns under which were made in 1821. He proposed to make a few alterations in it, agreeably to the suggestions of his hon. friend the member for Queen's County, who had paid great attention to the subject. He had given his valuable assistance in framing the Bill, and it would probably effect its object more completely, and with more regularity, than the former Bill. It might be interesting to Gentlemen to know the increase which had taken place in the population of Ireland since the first returns were made on the subject. By the first known account of the population of that country furnished by Sir William Petty, in 1672—the population was 1,100,000. In 1731, a census was taken by an order of the Irish House of Lords, and then the population was 2,010,000. In 1785, by the population returns then made, it appeared that the people amounted to 2,845,000. In 1812 an Act was passed for taking an account of the population, and it was supposed that, from various causes, the returns made under that Act, which were made by the Grand Juries, were not quite correct. Those returns were made in 1813, and by them the population amounted to 5,537,000. But the system then pursued was so inefficient that no great reliance could be placed on the result. In 1815, another Act was passed for the same purpose, but the care of taking the census was given into the hands of the Bench of Magistrates in counties instead of those of the Grand Juries. The bench of Magistrates, with the valuable aid of the Assistant-barristers, made the returns under the Act in 1821. Those returns were supposed to be very accurate, and by them the population was estimated at 6,801,827. This was supposed to have been a very perfect census. According to the returns under that Bill, comparing them with the census of 1731, it would appear that the population had rather more than trebled itself in ninety years. It had been mentioned in a late Report, drawn up he believed, by his hon. friend the member for Limerick, that the population had doubled itself in forty-five or forty-six years. He had no other observations to make; but, when the Bill was brought in, he should most willingly attend to the suggestions of any hon. Member who took an interest in the subject. If any Gentleman wished for information which was useful, and which could be acquired by means of this Bill, without rendering it too complicated, he should be happy to attend to his suggestions.

Mr. *O'Connell* begged to remark, that an account was taken in 1635, of the amount of the Irish population, which was then stated at 3,000,000; fifty years afterwards, when the calculation was made by Sir William Petty, the population had diminished nearly to the amount of 2,000,000. The decrease took place during the civil wars in Ireland, and suggested a frightful reflection as to the sanguinary character of those wars. Sir William Petty's accounts, however, were mere calculations. No census was taken until 1815. The gross numbers were given, but the results were not sufficiently accurate. The last census was greatly under the real amount. This was demonstrated by what afterwards occurred. At the time when great distress was felt in Ireland, and subscriptions made to relieve the sufferers, the number actually relieved in the county of Mayo, greatly exceeded, by no less than 35,000 persons, the total amount of the recorded population of that country. Of course, none of the better classes received charitable assistance; so that in that county it is demonstrated that the census fell short of the real population by at least 50,000 persons. He should suggest that this census should be made to discriminate, which the former did not, the religion of the inhabitants, so that the number professing different religions might be known. There were reasons—political reasons—why this should not be done in the last census; but those reasons were now totally at an end. No improper, and, indeed, no political motive could be gratified now by obtaining this information. An attempt had been made to procure information of this description in different counties in England; but the returns had not been satisfactory from any county, with the exception of Lancashire. As far as he understood the relative numbers of the different persuasions, it was impossible he thought that the temporalities of the Irish Church should remain as at present. If popular opinion was to have any weight, the arrangement must be corrected.

Bill ordered to be brought in.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, Nov. 15.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. For the abolition of Negro Slavery, by the Earl of ROSEBERRY, from Stirling and Leominster:—By Lord RIVERS, from Homerton:—By Lord WHARNCLIFFE, from forty-one places in Yorkshire:—By the Marquis of SLIGO, from eight places in Sligo:—By the Marquis of CLEVELAND and Lord GODERICH, from several places in Durham and Lincoln.

NEW POLICE.] Lord *Durham*, pursuant to notice, begged leave to present to their Lordships a petition from the parish of St. Mary, Newington, relating to the Metropolitan Police system. The petitioners complained, that under the 10th of his late Majesty, they were subjected to the new police establishment without their consent, and contrary to their wishes; and that, although the expense had been increased one-fourth, the protection to property was less efficient than under their own nightly-watch system, as was shown by an increased number of burglaries since the extension to their parish of the new system; and they prayed, either that the Act under which the metropolitan police was established should be repealed, or that the parish of St. Mary should be exempted from its provisions. The noble Lord said, he had inquired into the allegations of the petition, and found that in the six months preceding the establishment of the new police in this parish, the number of burglaries was 128, while the number in the six months which followed that establishment was 145. Then, as to the expense, he found that the charge of the nightly watch amounted to 3,000*l.*; while that of the less efficient new police was 4,390*l.* It was true that the nominal assessment was but 8*d.* per pound to the parish, which was not more, if so much, than the nightly-watch rate, but every house was assessed, be it inhabited or not. The aggregate sum had to be made good by the parish at large, making the actual rate to each householder 1*s.* in the pound. The petitioners complained that there was no office or place in the parish to which they could apply for aid or redress; that too many of the police were engaged on duty in the day-time, and too few in the night; that on those extraordinary emergencies—such as that on Tuesday last, for example, when a large force was required to protect the King's Ministers—there were no means of protection left for their properties. The petitioners also complained, that under the new Police Act, all control was taken out of their hands, not only over the appointment and conduct of the paid guardians of their properties, but over the expenditure of their own money. With respect to this point, he would suggest the expediency of authorizing the parish to have one of their own resident inhabitants connected with the police—say as an inspector—and exercising a control over its arrangements, founded on his knowledge of the wants, persons, and properties of his fellow-parishioners. To this proposition he did not anticipate any objection. As the public mind had been much directed of late to the subject of the new police, he thought himself bound to declare, that though he never happened to be so placed as to be able personally to judge of the efficiency of that body,—all he had seen of the new police, particularly in the neighbourhood of that House, gave him the highest idea of their vigilance, firmness, and good conduct. In paying this justly deserved tribute to the character of the new police as a body, it was not to be inferred that the principles of the measure under which it acted were unexceptionable. He had, on its being first proposed to their Lordships' attention, expressed his dissent from its arrangements, and had lamented the rapidity (owing to the very advanced period of the Session in which it had been introduced) with which it had been hurried through its several stages, so as to preclude the possibility of its details being properly discussed. Nor was his complaint even on the score of expense groundless; for he found that in the parish of St. George—known to many of their Lordships—the charge of the new police had been raised from 5,000*l.* per annum (the cost of the preceding nightly-watch) to not less than 17,000*l.*; to counterbalance which, he had not seen any proofs that the protection afforded to property had increased in efficiency. The next point to which he would invite the attention of their Lordships was, the objection to the sole control of the police being placed in the hands of the Home Secretary of State. He did not mean to enter then into the discussion of the constitutional principle involved in this objection, but to state a circumstance which had been communicated to him, and which, he trusted, would meet with a direct contradiction from the proper quarter. The circumstance to which he alluded was a written order to the inspectors and officers of the new police, "to return the names of those privates and subalterns who possessed votes at Norwich." Now, he could not take it upon him to say whether this order had, or had not, been actually issued; he was anxious to obtain satisfactory information on the subject, and he trusted, in the negative: but he thought the circumstance of the hon. Member who had been returned for Norwich—certainly not by the aid of the Government—having given notice of a motion for a bill to exclude members of the metropolitan police from voting at elections for Norwich, imparted an air at least of probability to the assertion that it had been issued. He was not one of those who disgraced themselves by raising a senseless cry against the new police as a body; on the contrary, he was a willing witness, as far as he had the means of judging, to the excellent demeanour and appearance of its members; all he wanted was, not an overthrow, but an amelioration of the system. He knew not whether the subject was to be inquired into in the other House, but he hoped it would be by a committee.

Lord *Suffield* was a resident in, and a member of, the vestry of the parish of St. George, to which the noble Baron had just alluded, and therefore trusted he might be permitted to say a few words with reference to the subject of the petition before their Lordships. Knowing that the conduct of the new police was to be touched upon by the noble Baron on the present occasion, he had instituted an inquiry into it, so far at least as his own parish was concerned; and the result of his inquiry was, that he differed altogether from the allegations of the petitioners, and from the views of the noble Baron concerning that body. He thought it necessary to state his opinion on this point, the rather that a certain portion of the press had indulged in much misrepresentation concerning the efficiency, the organization, and the expense of the new police; and he, indeed, felt that the public would be indebted to the noble Baron for affording them an opportunity for correcting those representations. The great error of those who usually pronounced an opinion on the present metropolitan police was, that they founded their judgment on some isolated branch or item of that establishment, and not on a consideration of its merits as a whole. To form a correct opinion of the efficiency and cost of the new police, it should be judged of as a whole; and, if thus judged, he was confident the result would be very different from that set forth by many imperfectly informed and interested persons. For example, if they judged of the cost and efficiency of the new police by the parish of St. George alone, it was true at first sight it might not appear an improvement equal to the additional expense; but when they took into consideration that it was not for escorting such of their Lordships as might happen to reside in Grosvenor-square from one side of that square to the other in safety, that they were rated higher than they had hitherto been, but because the poorer and more defenceless inhabitants of the lanes and alleys of the parish were now better watched than heretofore, and the persons and properties of all the inhabitants much better secured,—he was sure that they would admit that justice, not less than expediency, was consulted in making the rich pay a due proportion towards the security of the poor of the parish. Again, St. George's parish should be considered in its relation to the aggregate expense of all the parishes in the metropolitan district, and not by itself, or in comparison with one or two others. If it was rated higher than others, there were the parishes of St. Giles's and Pancras, in which the increased charge was but 1*d*. in the pound additional; and the parish of Islington, in which it was less than the cost of the old nightly-watch system. With respect to what the noble Baron had said as to the sole control of the new police being placed in the hands of a Minister of the Crown, he was free to admit he was friendly to the general principle that those who paid the money should exercise a superintendance over its management; but when he considered how dependent the efficiency of the police was on its uniformity of action and organization, and how incompatible that uniformity was with the system of separate parish management, he felt himself bound to maintain the present arrangement, as most conducive to uniformity, and thence to efficiency of conduct. As to the charge of interference by Ministers with the freedom of election at Norwich, he certainly had heard it asserted in more than one quarter, but, with the noble Baron, he trusted that the charge was without foundation. The manner in which he had heard the interference was effected was, by a pretext under which old and useless constables at Norwich, who had no votes, were temporarily superseded by such members of the metropolitan police who had votes; but he repeated, he expected to hear an official denial from his Majesty's Ministers of any species of interference whatever.

The Earl of *Rosslyn* felt himself relieved from the necessity of making a lengthened speech by the judicious observations of the noble Lord who had just addressed the House. With respect to the point last touched upon by him—namely, the interference with such of the new police as had votes at Norwich, by the inspectors,—he could not then take it upon him to give it officially a flat contradiction. All that he could do was, to express, as an individual having no specific knowledge of the circumstances one way or the other, his strong belief that such was not the fact—that it was wholly unfounded. Indeed, his belief of this had the strength of a conviction; for though not able to say positively that no order at all like to that quoted by the noble Baron (Durham) opposite had been issued, he understood, from the very best authority on the subject, that such of the new police as had votes were permitted to give them as they pleased,—and did vote for whom they pleased, without any interference on the part of their office. With respect to the allegation, that crime had increased in the parish of St. Mary, Newington, he begged leave to remind the noble Baron, that the matter had been inquired into in the proper quarter, and that it appeared that the efficiency of the new police had been, in the first instance, counteracted by circumstances which had since been remedied; and that some of the police, who had been charged with neglect of duty in that district, had been removed from the service. Then, with respect to the increase of the cost of the police in St. George's parish from that of the nightly-watch system, which increase he admitted was from 5,000*l.* to 17,000*l.* per annum, it should be recollected, in addition to what had been just observed by the noble Lord (Suffield) opposite, that under the present arrangement many districts in the neighbourhood of Grosvenor-place, which formerly were under the watch management of other parishes, were now included within the parish of St. George new police district, and that both these new districts and the parish of St. George were now much better protected than they had ever been, or were likely to have been, under the old nightly-watch system. Besides, St. George's parish was singular in many respects, and should not be taken as a sample of the parish expense of the metropolitan district at large. In St. John's parish, for instance, the increase had also been considerable, for the same reason as in St. George's; but still it was not much above the half more than the old watch charge. In all these instances of increased cost to particular parishes, they were bound to take into consideration the aggregate charge of the whole metropolitan police, as compared with the aggregate charge and efficiency of the old watch system; and that comparison would show that the expense—he meant the aggregate expense—of the police, very little exceeded that of the aggregate nightly-watch, while the efficiency admitted of no comparison. But this was not all; there were now ten or twelve districts in the immediate neighbourhood of the metropolis in which persons and property were secured, which actually had no watch or police whatever till the appointment of the new metropolitan police. Therefore, if the charge of the old watch was nearly equal to that of the new police, even without these ten or twelve districts to which he had just alluded, he was warranted in saying that it would have been much more had those districts been included; while it could not be pretended that the protection of lives and property would be at all equal. It might, he admitted, be a matter of fair discussion whether the present mode of imposing the police-rates was the most unexceptionable; but that discussion must keep in view the necessity of one uniform system of management, so essential to efficiency and order. Nor, if the matter were closely inquired into, would it, he thought, be seen that the present mode of rating was so highly objectionable as some persons had asserted. The new police charge was levied on the fixed principle of the county-rates; while the parochial poor-rates were levied on a variable system. The former was a charge of 8*d.* per pound on—not, as in the case of many parochial rates, on the rack-rent, but—on three-fourths of the nominal rent paid; so that the real charge was actually but 6*d.* in the pound: in other words, the parties assessed paid but three-fourths of their just proportion, on the principle of the parochial rates. This had been either forgotten or artfully overlooked by those persons who, in some parishes, had raised a clamorous outcry against the new police—an outcry, in most instances, the consequence of jealousy or disappointment that a large amount of patronage and control had been taken out of the hands of individuals (as might be inferred from the fact, that in St. Pancras alone there were not less than eighteen different watch-trusts, before the new system of uniformity had been established), for the purpose of securing police efficiency.

Lord *Suffield* had forgotten to touch upon two points which bore closely upon the question before their Lordships. One was, that in one of the parishes most clamourous against the cost of the new police establishment, he had been informed that the parish, for a couple of years, had been loaded with a debt, the onus and odium of which those who had contracted it thought the present a favourable opportunity of transferring to the new police from themselves. On a future day he would enter into the particulars of the transaction. The other point had been alluded to by the noble Earl who had just addressed the house—namely, the fact that the aggregate cost of the whole metropolitan police did not much exceed that of the nightly-watch, though it included ten or twelve districts to which that worshipful body's superintendence never in any way extended. The whole expense of the metropolitan police was 208,000*l.* per annum, while that of the nightly-watch (exclusive of private watchmen) was 160,000*l.*

Lord *Tenterden* was enabled, from his own experience in the King's Bench, to declare that there were cases in which property had been recovered since the establishment of the new police, which he was confident would never have been so recovered but for the intelligence, vigilance, and general good conduct of that body.

Lord *Durham* wished to know from his Majesty's Ministers, whether they intended to move for a repeal of the Metropolitan Police Act with a view to its amendment.

The Earl of *Rosslyn* replied, that Ministers had then no intention to submit any proposition to Parliament with a view to either repealing or amending the Act alluded to by that noble Baron.

The Petition laid on the Table.

THE REGENCY.] The *Lord Chancellor* addressed their Lordships to the following effect:—My Lords, I rise in consequence of the notice which I gave last week, in order to submit to your Lordships' judgment the measure which his Majesty's Ministers have prepared, in consequence of his Majesty's recommendation in his most gracious Speech from the Throne, for the purpose of providing for the Administration of the Government of the country, in the event of the demise of his Majesty, before the successor to the Crown shall have arrived at years of maturity. My Lords, I do not intend on this occasion to enter into any detailed consideration of the measure. At present, I will confine myself to stating the principles on which his Majesty's Ministers have proceeded in framing the Bill which I hold in my hand, and to describe the outline of its provisions. In the first place, my Lords, I must observe, that in framing this Bill his Majesty's Ministers have not thought it necessary to provide for every possible contingency that may occur. The principle by which they have been governed is this:—Having, in the first place, considered what were the various exigencies that might arise, the various periods at which those exigencies might arise, and the means which would exist of legislating for any of those exigencies at any of those periods, his Majesty's Ministers, for those cases in which it appeared to them that it would be difficult or inconvenient to legislate on their occurrence, have proposed to legislate on the present occasion. On the contrary, my Lords, whenever it appeared to them that, on the occurrence of any of the events under consideration, an opportunity would be afforded for legislating with no more difficulty or inconvenience than at the present moment, they have determined not to anticipate the decision of a future Legislature, but to leave the question free and untouched. Again, my Lords, in framing the Bill which I am about to have the honour of requesting your Lordships will allow me to lay on the Table, his Majesty's Ministers have thought it the wise and prudent course to legislate as little as the necessity of the case would admit; and to leave the existing law and the Constitution to operate wherever they are applicable. I think your Lordships will feel that, in pursuing this course, and acting on these principles, his Majesty's Ministers have discharged their duty in a manner the most consistent with prudence and wisdom. It must be obvious to your Lordships that the main point is, to protect the person, and to secure the succession to the Throne of her royal highness the Princess Victoria. That illustrious personage is now in the twelfth year of her age. The period of her majority, as qualifying her for the sovereignty of this country, will not arrive until her royal highness is eighteen years old. The principal object of this Bill, therefore, is to provide, in the event of the demise of his Majesty before the Princess Victoria shall have arrived at the age of eighteen, for the Administration of the Government of the country during the interval. That, my Lords, was the duty imposed upon his Majesty's Ministers in preparing this Bill; but I am quite sure that I am only speaking in unison with the feelings of every noble Lord who hears me, and in unison with the feelings of the great body of the people of this country, when I offer an earnest prayer that the valuable life of his Majesty may be long preserved to his faithful and affectionate subjects. I am quite sure that your Lordships, and the great body of the people of this country, feel that no greater calamity could befall us than the death of our present most gracious Sovereign. But, my Lords, notwithstanding all the wishes and all the hopes that we may entertain on that point, it is necessary that we look to what, however much it is to be deprecated, is nevertheless a possible occurrence; and it is in that view of the subject that his Majesty's Ministers have prepared the measure in question. The provisions of that measure are of the most simple character. The first question which your Lordships will naturally ask is—whom we propose as the guardian of her royal highness under the circumstances inferred? I am sure, however, that the answer will at once suggest itself to every mind. It would be quite impossible that we should recommend any other individual for that high office than the illustrious Princess, the mother of her royal highness the Princess Victoria. The manner in which her royal highness the Duchess of Kent has hitherto discharged her duty in the education of her illustrious offspring—and I speak upon the subject not from vague report, but from accurate information—gives us the best ground to hope most favourably of her royal highness's future conduct. Looking at the past, it is evident that we cannot find a better guardian for the time to come. With respect to the Regency, and the means to be provided for discharging the functions of the Sovereignty, it is important to separate that consideration from the other. It is, however, the recommendation of his Majesty's Ministers that, on the event of the demise of the Crown, what appears to us to be the only constitutional course should be adopted, and that her royal highness the Duchess of Kent should be appointed sole Regent. There is another question on which it is necessary for me to say a few words. It will be asked me—"it may happen that a child may be born to his present Majesty; do you intend to provide in your bill for that event?" My answer is distinctly in the negative. His Majesty's Ministers have thought it unnecessary to provide for such a contingency, for this reason:—Whenever such an event may occur, or whenever there may be a reasonable probability of its speedy occurrence, as it will be competent to the Legislature to provide for it, and it will be more easy to provide for it at the time than by anticipation, the case comes under the principle upon which we determined to frame the measure—namely, to abstain from legislating with reference to those contingencies, on which, whenever they occur, Parliament may legislate without any difficulty or inconvenience. For that reason, my Lords, we do not propose to provide for such an event. The next point to which I am desirous of calling your Lordships' attention is one of no inconsiderable importance. I have already said, that his Majesty's Ministers propose that her royal highness the Duchess of Kent shall be the sole Regent. The question is, whether her royal highness should have a Council to assist her? If we were to be guided by precedents, those precedents are in favour of the appointment of such a Council. I do not speak of the precedents of old times; the alteration of habits, the change in the circumstances and situation of the country, render such precedents very remotely applicable to the present case. It would be difficult also to find in any of those ancient precedents an instance similar to the present. Passing by, therefore, all those precedents, I proceed at once to advert to two of more modern date; the one occurring in the latter part of the reign of George 2nd, in the year 1751; the other occurring in the fifty-first year of George 3rd. In both those cases a Council was appointed to assist the Regent. My Lords, no opportunity was afforded us of judging, by practical experience, how far those precedents were such as it would be desirable to follow. On that point, therefore, no argument can be raised. But, my Lords, it has appeared to his Majesty's Government, and I have no doubt that it will appear to your Lordships, that as the prerogatives with which the Crown is invested are intended for the preservation of that balance between the different estates of the realm indispensable to the maintenance of the Constitution; and as, therefore, the Crown itself ought not to be deprived of prerogatives so essential, the expediency of not diminishing the Royal prerogatives applies still more strongly to a Regent; because the limited duration of the power of a Regent renders that power less influential. If, my Lords, you take from a Regent those prerogatives which you would hesitate to take from a Sovereign, because you know that by so doing you would endanger the Constitution, you would certainly produce the evil that you would wish to avoid. On these principles, and on these grounds, we object to the appointment of a Council, professedly to assist, but in reality to control, the Regent. I do not mean to say that a position of affairs might not arise—that a Regent might not be chosen, which position and which choice might not render it highly proper to appoint a Council. A case might occur in which it would be necessary to select as Regent an individual of great ambition, of great popularity, of great influence, of great authority, whose sole sway might be dangerous to the State. The power of such an individual it might be wise and prudent to circumscribe by surrounding him with a Council. But such, my Lords, is not the case now. The Regent whom we propose to appoint can never succeed to the Throne; her interests are identified with those of the future Sovereign; she is united to her by the tenderest ties; it will be the interest of the Regent to add to the authority of the future Sovereign; none of those motives for self-aggrandisement can occur in this real case, which might occur in the imaginary case that I have just described. In the precedent of 1751 many debates took place in the other House of Parliament. The arguments of Mr. Speaker Onslow, and of other hon. Members who were opposed to the appointment of a Council of Regency, appear to me to have great weight. The Attorney-general of that day, Mr. Dudley Ryder, gave it as his decided opinion, that a sole Regent, unfettered by any Council of Regency, was much more consonant to the principles of the Constitution than a Regent surrounded and checked by such a Council. The only argument urged at that time by the supporters of the Council was, that Parliament was establishing a precedent; and that cases might occur in which the appointment of a Council of Regency would be highly expedient, but might be resisted on the score of precedent. But surely, my Lords, that was weak and shallow reasoning. Why not allow every case to be judged of by its own merits? Why not leave the Legislature to deal with every future emergency precisely according to its particular character and circumstances? To me it appears to be a monstrous proposition, that if at any period the interests of the country require the appointment of a Council of Regency, the Legislature shall be precluded from making such an appointment, because a preceding Legislature, under circumstances of a different nature, had abstained from it! At the period to which I have been adverting, the Council was to be composed of fourteen individuals, seven of whom were to be Ministers of State. There was this provision, that no Member of the Council should be removed from it without the concurrence of half the members of the Council. Looking, therefore, even at the manner in which the Council was formed, it is not a precedent which I could recommend for imitation. For these reasons, I submit to your Lordships that it is far better, in the present instance, that her

Royal Highness the Duchess of Kent should not be fettered by any Council; but that she should be left to administer the Government by means of the responsible Ministers of the Crown. That is the course which his Majesty's Ministers conceive to be most consistent with a just and efficient administration of the Government.—There is still another question, my Lords, to which, however reluctantly, I am compelled to advert. I say reluctantly, because it refers to a possible case for which we have no authority, no precedent. The subject was alluded to in the last Session by a noble Earl who is not now in his place. It is a subject which is certainly beset with very grave difficulties; and I confess, my Lords, that I approach it with some degree of apprehension. It was stated by the noble Earl to whom I have alluded, that, although the Monarch might have no child living at the time of his death, a posthumous child might, nevertheless, be born. In that case, my Lords, clearly, and without the possibility of controversy, that child, whenever its birth took place, would instantly succeed to the Throne. Of that, there is no doubt whatever. But the great difficulty is to decide what are the existing rights in the interval between the demise of the Crown and the birth of such a child. It is very extraordinary, my Lords, that as far as I have been able to ascertain, assisted on the subject as I have been by some able friends, no case of the kind has occurred in this country since the Norman Conquest. It is very extraordinary, that with respect to this point, no notice has been taken by any old writer on our law and Constitution. In the debates on the Exclusion Bill in the reign of Charles 2nd, it was incidentally noticed in the other House of Parliament. A very learned man, Mr. Hargreave, in a work entitled "Brief Deductions," has stated in distinct terms, that the law on the subject is unsettled; and I confess, my Lords, that I have been unable to find anything opposed to that statement. If we turn our attention from our own country, and look to what has occurred with reference to the monarchy of France, we shall find only two instances, in which a Royal posthumous child has been born. The one was subsequently to the death of Henry 5th. On that occasion, on the demise of the Sovereign, the Presumptive Heir to the Crown was declared Regent. The child proved to be a son, and of course immediately succeeded to the Throne. Charles the Fair left his widow seven months gone with child. In that case also, the Presumptive Heir to the Crown was declared Regent. But in that case, the child proved to be a daughter, and was, of course, excluded from the Throne by the Salique law. But, my Lords, the principles of a foreign government are not those to which we ought to look for a model. Nor are the circumstances of the two countries the same. We are, therefore, driven to the necessity of considering the subject with reference to what appears to be the general principle of our own law. The descent of the Crown follows the rules of the descent of real property, in most respects, except where there are two daughters, in which the real property is shared between them. It becomes, therefore, important to inquire what happens with reference to a posthumous child entitled to real property. My Lords, it has been settled in the Courts of Justice of this country, that such a child, before it is born, cannot be seised of such property. The right to enjoy and possess it is in the presumptive heir. He has the whole interest in it, from the death of his predecessor until the birth of the child. That precisely the same doctrine stands good with respect to the Crown, I will not assert with confidence; but this principle is undoubtedly common to both; namely, that there can be no abeyance—that there can be no vacancy. The King never dies. There must always be a Sovereign: The principle applied to real property is applicable to the Crown. The child unborn cannot be seised of the Crown: it must devolve for the time to the Presumptive Heir. My Lords, I know that this is only reasoning from analogy. I submit it as such only to your Lordships' consideration; I beg to say, to your Lordship's indulgent consideration; seeing the nature of the question, and the difficulties which surround it. My Lords, we have two courses to pursue; we must either adopt the course taken in the French monarchy, or we must appoint a Regent to administer the functions of the Government in the interval between the death of the Monarch and the birth of the posthumous child. Your Lordships will, however, advert to this circumstance—that the government, under any Regency, must be administered in the name and on behalf of the Sovereign. If you appoint a Regent to administer the Government, without stating that he is to administer it in the name and on the behalf of the Sovereign, you create a Parliamentary Sovereign under the title of Regent. It would be more correct, therefore, under such circumstances, to say that the Regent shall administer the Government in the name and on behalf of the Presumptive Heir; and that he shall be liable to be divested of his authority on the birth of the posthumous child. When I say, that the King never dies, I appeal to the uniform proceedings of our Courts of Justice. There is no proceeding in any civil case, there is no proceeding in any criminal case, which does not take place in the name of the King. Such or such an act is said to be against the King's peace. The King is always supposed to exist. I repeat, therefore, my Lords, that the best course will be, to appoint a Regent, to act for the Presumptive Heir to the Crown, liable to be divested of his authority on the birth of a posthumous child.—The seisin in law must rest somewhere, and in whom ought it to rest if not in the Heir Presumptive? This is the principle of the law of real property; and the same maxim and the same principle apply, in the fullest extent, if we argue from analogy, in regulating the descent of the Crown. There is, too, another point connected with this part of the question, which I think merits your Lordships' consideration. If you say that the succession to the Throne can be either vacant or in suspension until there is no possibility of a child being born to destroy the claim of the Heir Presumptive, it may happen that, even with the probability of such an event taking place, a child may eventually not be born. It may therefore occur, my Lords, that the Presumptive Heir may be the Monarch entitled to the Throne upon the very instant of the demise of the last possessor of the Crown, and that you have, by the appointment of a Regency under such circumstances, and under the expectation of the birth of another Heir to the Throne, deprived him of his right, and excluded him from taking that which was his right the moment of the demise of the former Sovereign. In considering all the bearings of a question so difficult and complicated, I have felt it my duty to consult all those learned men who are the official advisers of the Crown, and they one and all concur in that view of the question which I have now endeavoured to explain to your Lordships, and agree in opinion that there are no cases on record by which we can regulate our decision, but that we must guide ourselves by reasoning from analogy, and by a reference to those laws regulating the descent of real property, to which I have already called your Lordships' attention. Before your Lordships come to any decision on a question of such grave importance, I would suggest the propriety of allowing some little time to pass by, in order that your Lordships may have an opportunity to put yourselves in possession of all the authorities which are connected with that part of the subject. On the principle, however, that it is necessary to provide for the possibility of the birth of a posthumous child, we propose, on the same terms and to the same extent that we have thought it right to make her Royal Highness the Duchess of Kent the guardian of the Heiress Presumptive, and the Regent of the Kingdom during her minority—we now propose, I say, to provide by the Bill, that in the event of the birth of a child after the demise of the Sovereign, her Majesty the Queen should become the guardian of that child, and the Regent of the Kingdom during the continuance of the minority of that child; the same arguments and the same principles apply equally to the one case as to the other, and the deep interest which the parent must always have in the safety and prosperity of her offspring point out that parent as the fittest and most proper person to be the guardian of the infant, and the Regent during its minority. This, my Lords, is the outline of the Bill which I submit to your consideration. I abstain from entering into details, because I feel that those details will be much better understood by an examination of the Bill itself. We propose then, my Lords, that her Royal Highness the Duchess of Kent shall, in the event of the demise of the present Sovereign, be the Guardian of the Heiress Presumptive, and the Regent of the Kingdom, until the Princess arrives at her majority—that is, the age of eighteen years; and we also propose, that in the event of the birth of a posthumous child, her Majesty the Queen should be in the same manner the guardian of the child, and the Regent, acting in the name and on the behalf of the infant during its minority. These, my Lords, are the heads of the Bill. The details, as I said before, it is unnecessary to enter into at this moment, and I shall therefore conclude by laying the Bill on your Lordships' Table, praying leave that it may now be read a first time.

The Earl of *Eldon* said, he could not allow that opportunity to pass by without expressing his feeling that the House and the country were deeply indebted to the noble Lord for the attention he had bestowed on a question of so much importance, and still more for the able and eloquent manner in which he had brought it under their consideration, stating the grounds on which he relied for their concurrence. He should stand justly chargeable with most unpardonable vanity, if, after the grave and weighty consideration which the noble Lord had bestowed on every part of the question, he should now presume to express any difference of opinion without maturely weighing and examining all the provisions of the Bill. One thing, however, he might say now, and that was, that on the question of the law, as it applied to the cases stated by the noble Lord, he (Lord Eldon) fully agreed with him. All the points connected with the law of the case had been so fully and ably stated by the noble and learned Lord, that he had very little to say; but he would observe, that it was the interest of all on whom the settlement of this important question, depended to take care that there should be perfect unanimity on all that was said and done connected with it. Under that persuasion he was confident that advice, from whatever quarter, would be well received and conscientiously acted upon. He should, for the present, content himself with expressing again his concurrence in all that had been said of the law of the case, and take a few days for deliberation before he offered any opinion on the details.

The Bill, entitled "An Act to provide for the Administration of the Government of the country, in case the Crown should descend to her Royal Highness the Princess Alexandrina Victoria, daughter of his late Royal Highness the Duke of Kent, being under the age of eighteen years, and for the care and guardianship of her person," was then read a first time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, Nov. 15.

Minutes.] Bills brought in. By Mr. Courtenay, to Amend an Act passed in the 6th year of his late Majesty, relating to Colonial Trade:—By Mr. Alderman Thompson, to declare in what instance Charitable Institutions should be liable to pay Rates for local purposes:—By the Attorney General, to amend the Administration of Justice Act, passed last Session.

A Select Committee, on the Motion of Lord F. L. Gower, was appointed to inquire into Tolls and Customs (Ireland).

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Kennedy, the number of persons rated at 10*l*., 15*l*., and 20*l*. in the Royal Burghs of Scotland; and of the number of persons in whom the Elective Franchise is vested:—On the Motion of Mr. Hume, all Pensions granted on the Civil Lists of England, Scotland, and Ireland.

Mr. Speaker stated, that he had received a letter from Mr. Hodson, one of the Members returned for Wigan, declaring that it was not his intention to take his seat.

Petitions presented. Against the following Elections:—For the County of Galway, Carrickfergus, County of Dumbarton, County of Clare, Durham, Truro, Linlithgow, Grantham, Carlow, Hythe, Londonderry, Huntingdon, Coleraine, and Stamford. By Mr. Curteis, from Southover, praying for a Reform in Parliament, and for a Repeal of the Game Laws and Corn Laws. For the abolition of Colonial Slavery, by Lord Ebrington, six from Devonshire:—By Mr. Pendarvis, eleven from Cornwall:—By Mr. Struth, eight from Derbyshire:—By Mr. Alderman Thompson, from Dissenters of Fetter-lane:—By Mr. Byng, from Dissenters of Cannon-street; —By Mr. Drake, from Amersham:—By Mr. Drummond, from Stirling:—By Mr. Lister, from Poole:—By Mr. Adeane, from Barringborne:—By Mr. Tyrrell, from Bury St. Edmonds:—By General Palmer, from Bath:—By Mr. Leigh Keck, from Lutterworth, in Leicestershire:—By Sir J. Graham, from Cockermouth, in Cumberland:—By Mr. Rice, from places in Limerick: —By Mr. Denman, from two Dissenting Congregations in Nottingham:—By Lord Morpeth, from Scarborough, Whitby, Swalham, North Dalton, and some other places: —By Lord Stanley, ninety-six from Lancashire:—By Mr. Jephson, from Fermoy:—By Lord Wm. Powlett, from Thirsk and Barnard Castle:—By Sir R. Peel, from Tamworth:—By Mr. Wrightson, from Hull:—By Mr. Coke, four from the County of Norfolk:—By Lord Uxbridge, from Holyhead:—By Lord Euston, from a Parish in Norfolk:—By Sir R. Heron, from Peterborough:—By Sir R. Ferguson, from Durleton: For a Repeal of the Duty upon Seaborne Coals, from Ipswich, by Mr. R. Dundas:—By Mr. Bell, from the Coal-owners on the Tyne:—By Lord F. Osborne, from Wisbeach:—By Mr. Evans, from Sheepshead, in Lancashire. The last Petition also prayed for a Repeal of the Game and Corn-laws, and a Reform in Parliament: as did also a Petition presented by Sir J. Graham, from the resident Electors of Cockermouth. By Mr. O'Connell, from the Parish of Clondalkin, praying for a Repeal of the Union. By Mr. Hodges, from two Parishes in Kent, complaining of Distress, and praying for a repeal of the Malt Tax, and a reduction of the Assessed Taxes. By Mr. S. Rice, from Limerick, for the equalization of the Spirit Duties.

Duty on Sea-Borne Coals.] Mr. *Bell*, in presenting a petition from the coal-owners of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, against this duty, observed, that as the subject was to be brought before the House by the hon. member for Limerick, he would only trouble the House for a very few minutes. The petition came from a body of persons who had embarked nearly one million and a half in the coal-trade of Northumberland, and they complained, with great justice, of the hardships to which they were exposed by the oppressive duty of 6*s*. per chaldron, charged on all coals carried coastwise.

They considered themselves unjustly treated, in being deprived of advantages possessed by those who carried their coals along canals and rail-roads. But though the coal-owners prayed to be relieved from this partial tax, they disclaimed all wish to throw it on the inland coal-owner, or any other branch of the community. He did not plead, however, for the coal-owner alone: he was the advocate of the public—which suffered even more than the coal-owner by the existence of this most odious tax on industry. If the tax were repealed, a considerable fall in price would be the inevitable consequence; and he was borne out by facts in making this assertion, for when the 3*s.* 4*d.* duty, as it was called, was repealed in 1824, the best coals fell in the London markets from 46*s.* to 36*s.* 6*d.*, in the course of three years. Since the repeal of that duty, coals had fallen in price in the North also. This fact shewed, that if the 6*s.* duty were taken off, the coal owner would not pocket, as was said, the whole amount. Such could not be the case—coals were now lower in the North than they were in 1828, and competition would prevent the coal-owner from raising them one penny the chaldron beyond the present price. He would benefit by the increased consumption no doubt; but the consumer and the carrier would derive the greatest advantage from the repeal of the tax. He heard, with regret the declaration of the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other evening, but he hoped that the sense of the House would be found so strong against the continuance of this oppressive tax, on the motion of the hon. member for Limerick, that the right hon. Gentleman would be compelled at once to abandon it entirely. From what had recently occurred in the Netherlands, there could be little doubt but that Holland would, ere long, require a supply of coals from this country, and he hoped, therefore, that every facility would be given to the exportation of coals, by removing the duty on export of 17*s.* the chaldron, which was a complete prohibition to foreign trade. By encouraging exportation additional employment would be given to the shipping-interest, which required every possible encouragement to keep it from ruin. The petition alluded also to another tax peculiar to the river Tyne, and from which all other places whence coals are shipped are altogether exempt. This tax was commonly called the Richmond shilling, being a duty of one shilling a chaldron on all coals shipped from the river Tyne. It yielded about 35,000*l.* per annum, and originated in an arbitrary grant from Charles 2nd to the Richmond family, of whom it was purchased, in 1799, by the Government for 400,000*l.* From that period to the 5th of January, 1827, Government received 862,000*l.* from this tax, which, after repaying the purchase money, left a surplus of 462,000*l.* To show the extreme hardship of this tax, it was only necessary to state, that in a vessel carrying 200 chaldrons of coals, it makes the difference of 60*l.* in the year, whether she loads at Shields, Sunderland, Stockton, or in the Tyne, all the former places being exempt from this odious and partial tax. He trusted that justice would be done by the partial tax being repealed, and that industry would be promoted by the repeal of the general tax.

Mr. *Hodgson* did not wish to take up the time of the House on the present occasion, as an opportunity would soon occur of entering into the subject at length, by an hon. Member on the opposite side of the House having given notice of a motion on the subject. He agreed in the observations of the hon. Member who presented the petition, and would only add a very few words in support of its prayer. He agreed with that hon. Gentleman in thinking that the coal-tax was much more oppressive than any other tax, and affected the comforts of the people to a much greater extent. At the same time, it was a most unjust tax, because it was only paid by persons living in certain districts, and on coals carried coastwise. He believed that it was the only tax on an absolute necessary of life which affected all classes of the people, and fell particularly heavy on the lower orders. No measure could afford so much benefit to the people as the repeal of this tax. This oppressive tax was not only paid by the people of this country, but also by those of Ireland, where it was most severely felt. The hon. member for Waterford would, therefore, he was sure, lend the assistance of his talents to get it abolished. It was a tax of which the collection was attended with a great expense; for he understood that Custom-house establishments were kept up at several of the smaller ports, solely for the purpose of collecting it. If, therefore, it was repealed, those establishments might be abolished.

Mr. *Cresset Pelham* hoped, that if any alteration were made in this tax, care would be taken that the coal-owners in the internal parts of the country should not be injured. Hon. Gentlemen should remember, that the owners of coal-mines in the North possessed advantages which those in other parts did not. In the county which he had the honour to represent, important interests were involved, and due care ought to be taken before any change was made, so that no injury should be done.

Petition to be printed.

IRISH LANDLORDS.] Mr. *O'Connell* presented a petition from two parishes in the county of Westmeath, complaining of distress, praying for the introduction of Poor-laws, inveighing against the arbitrary conduct of the Duke of Buckingham's agent, accusing him of endeavouring to sweep the people off the lands—and declaring, that with this view he had sought to denounce them as belonging to the society of Ribbonmen.

The Marquis of *Chandos* begged leave to contradict all the assertions set forth in the petition, and said, it was fortunate that the gentleman alluded to was in town to clear himself from the charges preferred against him. He denied that the land was overlet, and he stated that he had the authority of that gentleman for saying, that he never had suspected the tenants on the estate of being Ribbonmen, and that there had only been one case of a tenant having been ejected from the land, and that was in consequence of his having proceeded upon false information, and refusing to pay his rent without previously having a receipt. All the disturbance which had occurred in these parishes arose from the improper interference of the Priest, and inflammatory harangues delivered from the altar of his chapel. A tenant, on being applied to lately for his rent, had refused to pay it, declaring that he had been ordered not to pay it by the Priest, and that he would sooner go through hell-fires than disobey his reverence. In short, the tenants had been encouraged to pay no rent so long as the gentleman alluded to continued agent. In conclusion, he expressed his hope, that the learned Gentleman would for the future examine the truth of the assertions made in petitions, before he presented them to the House.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that having ascertained that the signatures to the petition were genuine, he considered that it was his duty to present it. He trusted that he had not gone beyond his duty; and he had not been wanting in the proper courtesy, as he had submitted the petition to the inspection of the nearest relative of the noble Marquis with whom he was acquainted. As to what had been alleged by his Grace's agent respecting the parish Priest, he (Mr. O'Connell) must say, that he considered him incapable of the conduct imputed to him, and he had no doubt that before long he should have a petition from that reverend person in denial of it.

Lord *Nugent* confirmed the learned Gentleman's statement. The hon. and learned member for Waterford certainly had sent him the petition, and he had communicated the contents of it to his noble relative.

CLERK OF THE COUNCIL.] Mr. *Stanley*, after postponing his motion about the expenditure on the Rideau Canal to Monday next, or to whatever other day the committee might first sit, stated, that one of the Clerks of the Council had died suddenly that day, and asked if there was any intention on the part of Government to abolish his place, which was useless although the possessor received 2,500*l.* a-year.

Sir *R. Peel* said, he had not heard of the gentleman's death until that moment, and had not, therefore, turned his attention to the subject.

PROTESTANT SOLDIERS AND CATHOLIC WORSHIP.] Lord *Morpeth* presented a petition from the Minister and Inhabitants of Bossiney, Lincolnshire, against compelling Protestant soldiers in the British army, while on foreign service, to take part in the procession and public ceremonies of the Catholic religion. The petitioners declared, that such compulsion was an injury inflicted on tender consciences, and was, therefore, a practice condemned by the Almighty himself. Lord Morpeth admitted, that soldiers on foreign service ought not to show their disrespect to the religion of the country in which they happened to be stationed, but he insisted at the same time, that unless in case of absolute necessity, they ought not to be compelled to join in any declared mark of respect to it. He believed, that this petition had arisen out of the case of the two officers at Malta, and he had heard that the same compulsion which had been attempted to be employed in this case was employed in Corfu, and some other of our garrisons.

Sir *G. Murray* said, he believed, in the first place, that the petition was founded in mistake, for he had reason to suppose that no compulsion was ever used in order to make Protestant soldiers attend the religious ceremonies of Catholics. He had the stronger reason for asserting this to be his belief, since he had lately had a conversation with an officer from Corfu, who assured him that no compulsion whatever had been used with regard to the soldiers attending any religious ceremony.

Lord *Morpeth* said, that if the right hon. Gentleman's belief was well founded, his explanation must of course be satisfactory.

Petition to be printed.

Reform.—Scotch Burghs] Sir *R. Ferguson* presented a petition from Cupar, Fife, in favour of Reform, and especially in favour of Reform in the Representation or rather non-representation of the Scotch boroughs. He declared, that he had been both astonished and hurt at hearing that a noble Duke had said, in another place, that the country was satisfied with the present system, and that he was not prepared to agree to any proposition for Reform. If the noble Duke really had made any such declaration, and supposed, indeed, that the people were satisfied with the present system, he (Sir R. Ferguson) must say, that the noble Duke was quite ignorant of the feelings of the people. By such a declaration the people would not be stopped, but would press forward with double zeal in the cause of Reform; for he felt bound to say, that, in his belief, there was but one opinion as to the necessity of Reform from one end of the kingdom to the other.

Mr. *Kennedy* said, that as this was the first petition that had been presented from Scotland on the subject, he must take the opportunity of observing, that he entreated the House to pay the utmost attention to the wishes of the people of Scotland on the question of Reform. His own opinion was firmly settled on this question, though he did not concur with the petitioners in asking for the ballot.

Mr. *Hume* presented six petitions from Perth, Arbroath, Brechin, and Stockport, for Reform and reduction of Taxation. The boroughs from which these petitions came, were some of the worst specimens of our Scotch boroughs. The petitions, however, were most respectably signed, but he believed that some of the places from which they were sent would send no more, unless Ministers exhibited a disposition to afford relief to the petitioners. It was with deep regret that he heard of the declaration of a noble Duke in another place, and from that declaration he anticipated a great deal of mischief. He declared, that the universal wish of the people of Scotland was for the ballot.

Mr. *Dundas* denied, that any such feeling existed in Scotland in favour of the ballot. He denied, too, that the people wished the reform of which the hon. Member had talked; he absolutely denied, that they wanted reform in the Representation; at least that was not the general feeling in Scotland.

Mr. *Kennedy* should be perfectly contented if that question were to be decided by the expression of opinion that the petitions to that House would disclose.

Sir *C. Forbes* said, that he could not help thinking the hon. member for Middlesex had borne rather hardly upon Brechin, to which borough he was mainly indebted for being four times returned to Parliament before he got his present seat, and that it was rather ungrateful in him now to turn round upon that borough, and represent it as one of the worst in Scotland.

Mr. *Hume* answered that the majority of five was three, and that having Montrose and Arbroath with him, he only wanted Brechin to complete that majority. In that way Brechin had returned him to Parliament. He denied, however, that it had ever done so corruptly. He did not, indeed, owe much gratitude to the self-constituted electors of Brechin as they were against him, but were afraid of their fellow-townsmen if they rejected him. The hon. member for Edinburgh had denied that the people in Edinburgh wanted Reform in Parliament. He would ask that hon. Member if he had the courage to risk the decision of that question by a ballot of the people of Scotland? If the people of Edinburgh voted by ballot, the hon. Member, who now sat in the House for that City would be the last man who would represent it. The hon. Member spoke the opinions of the thirty or forty men by whom he was returned, but not of the 125,000 inhabitants whom he pretended to represent, but who had no vote in his election. It was a shameful blot on the character of that House, that among such a population there should be but so few voters.

Mr. *Dundas* said, the hon. member for Middlesex was mistaken, when he said that there were only forty electors for Edinburgh; but he knew nothing of the Constitution of Edinburgh, and therefore he made bold assertions. It was ignorance that made him bold. Among his (Mr. Dundas's) electors, were fourteen persons who were chosen by the people, as elders or deacons, and that was a public election as far as it went.

Sir *J. Graham* observed, that although he might be almost afraid of the censure of the hon. Member opposite, for his ignorance exhibited in what he was about to say, he could not avoid feeling a wish to state one fact on this subject. The last time that the people of Scotland had the opportunity of pronouncing their opinion on the question of reform was in the year 1826, when the present Chief Baron of Scotland brought that question under the consideration of the House. The people of Scotland then showed, that there were in Edinburgh 10,000 persons rated to the annual amount of 5*l.*, and that, after deducting the number of women and other persons unqualified to vote, there remained 7,256 householders, who signed a petition to that House, praying that Parliament would alter the mode of election for Scotland. The hon. member for Edinburgh would find the greatest difficulty in producing petitions from Scotland, with or without the ballot, that should express an opinion (he meant the opinion of men of property, not the rabble) at all conformable to the declaration of the Duke of Wellington, that imagination could not conceive a system of representation so perfect as that which was established in the United Kingdom. He was sure, that the hon. member for Edinburgh would not find 500 people in Scotland who would go that length with him, or who would pretend in any way to vindicate the present mode of returning Members. With regard to the mystification and craft of returning Members, they had been already well exposed by others, and he had only to say, that, in his opinion, however high the tone taken by the Ministers, or haughty the determination they expressed on the subject, they would find that they could not continue this corrupt system against the moderate but firm and universal demands for reform that were uttered by the people of this empire.

Mr. *Kennedy* said, that the Corporation by which the hon. member for Edinburgh was returned, consisted of thirty-three persons, and the election of fourteen of them, it was true, did participate in some degree of a popular election—but nineteen out of the thirty-three were self-elected, so that the whole fabric of popular election, which the imagination of the hon. member for Edinburgh had erected, at once fell to the ground.

Mr. *Dundas* affirmed, that it stood where it did. Fourteen of these persons were popularly elected, and they conduced to the election of the others.

Mr. *Hume* said, that the Council influenced the election of the whole thirty-three, and that the people of Edinburgh had no more to do with the election of the hon. Member than had the people of Japan.

Mr. *Dundas* said, the fourteen had a share in the election.

Petitions read and laid on the Table.

FORFAR, &c. ELECTION.] Mr. *S. Wortley* observed, that he could find no instance of Election Petitions being decided before a short recess, and many instances of petitions deferred till after such a recess; and as it would occasion great inconvenience to keep witnesses in town for a long period, from so distant a place as the north of Scotland, he moved that the consideration of the election petition against him should be postponed from the 2nd of December to some future day.

Sir *C. Forbes* opposed the Motion, contending that the matter in dispute lay in a nutshell, and that the hon. Member would not be able to maintain his seat for five minutes after the meeting of the committee to try the question.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* was in favour of delay, and recommended further, that all the election petitions, but those where double returns had been made, should be postponed until after the holidays, which, it was understood, were to last for a month or six weeks.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* contended, that the hon. Gentleman (Mr. S. Wortley) had laid no special circumstances before the House to warrant a departure from the general rule, as applied to election petitions.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* would have consented to a motion to defer the consideration of the petition in question for a few days: he argued that it was one of the earliest duties of the House to ascertain who ought or ought not to sit as its Members, and that it would operate most unjustly to the parties, if election petitions generally were postponed until after the holidays.

Mr. S. Wortley withdrew his Motion.

INCENDIARIES IN THE COUNTRY.] Mr. *H. Sumner* wished to put a question to the right hon. Secretary for the Home Department, relative to the incendiary proceedings in several of the Home Counties. They had commenced in Kent, and had been alarmingly extended, till they had unfortunately reached the county to which he belonged. The Magistrates believed, that at present they had not sufficient power to swear in special constables prospectively; they could only swear them in when tumults occurred, and then only locally. He would beg leave, therefore, to suggest, that a short bill, for a short term, might be advantageously brought in, to constitute a constabulary force to perform the duty of watch and ward, by which a great deal of mischief might be prevented. He wished to know, therefore, whether the right hon. Gentleman had taken into his consideration any measure of that nature, or any other that might be effectual for the end in view.

Sir *Robert Peel* replied, I can assure the hon. Member, that four or five hours every day of my life are spent in endeavouring to discover the perpetrators of these atrocious crimes. I know that voluntary associations have been formed to establish watch and ward in many threatened situations; and I believe that nothing but extraordinary local vigilance will provide effectual security against these abominable offenders. No military force, no yeomanry force, can, I am afraid, defeat the wicked designs of men who have some ulterior object in view beyond the mere redress of a local evil: that I firmly believe. If any measure can be suggested, by forming local associations, or otherwise, for which the assistance of Parliament or of Government may be necessary, I shall be most happy to give it every possible consideration. I am perfectly certain that there is no plan, promising to be effectual, which this House would not cheerfully sanction, in order to terminate a system so disgraceful. The House will not require me to disclose the measures I am adopting to detect the perpetrators—to do so would defeat the object itself. No expense, no exertion, on my part, has been spared, to bring these iniquitous persons to justice. If any difficulty should arise in forming voluntary associations, or in swearing in special constables, the House will, as I have said, be ready to sanction any mode of removing that difficulty, and I may add, for myself, that I will give any proposition my most willing attention.

Mr. *Portman* observed, that as the law stood at present, special constables might be sworn in by Magistrates.

Sir *Robert Peel* referred to the Statute of the 1st Geo. 4th, which enabled Magistrates to appoint special constables under certain circumstances. He did not know that it applied to cases where there was a mere apprehension of tumult.

Mr. *Denison.*—As I have the honour to sit here for Surrey, I may, perhaps, with propriety, take this opportunity of saying, that I deeply lament, in common with my hon. friend (if he will allow me to call him so), the events which, during the three last nights, have disgraced the county. Whether the plan suggested be the best, I cannot now decide; but that some plan ought to be adopted to put down these abominable outrages, as the right hon. Secretary justly calls them, promptly and decisively, is quite clear. As to the spirit of the county, over which I have recently travelled, I must deny *in toto*, that there is anything approaching disloyalty among any class of the inhabitants: they are attached to the Monarchy and to the Monarch; but that they are satisfied with the King's Ministers I will by no means take upon me to affirm. The dissatisfaction has been increased by the Speech recently put into his Majesty's mouth, and still more by the extraordinary and uncalled for declaration of the Duke of Wellington in the other House. The people want retrenchment and reform.

And I speak not only of the lower but of the middle, well-informed and thinking classes. They are also dissatisfied with the proposition regarding the Civil List. Let the right hon. Gentleman recollect, that to put an end to this spirit, Ministers must both retrench and reform—they must repeal taxes, and consent to that change in the representation which is required by the corruptions that have crept into it. Above all, let Ministers repeal the imposts upon productive industry, and let landlords reduce their rents; and farmers will then be able to give such wages to their labourers, as will enable them to support their families. At all events, every body will agree that the prevailing outrages must be terminated speedily and effectually.

Mr. *Hume.*—Arrangements for establishing associations for self-defence have, I know, been made in several parts of the County of Middlesex; and in the parish of St. Anne, Limehouse, at a meeting convened by advertisement, the following Resolution was very recently adopted:—

> "We declare in the first place, in the most solemn manner, our firm and devoted loyalty to our excellent King, and our attachment to the principles of the Constitution, and to the political and sacred institutions of our country.
>
> "Possessing, in our property, and in our families, an unequivocal stake in the preservation of social order, we declare our readiness, at any and every hazard, to exert our utmost efforts for the suppression of tumult and disorder, and for the protection of persons and property from violence.
>
> "But we owe it to truth, to justice, and to policy, to declare, that while we are aware that the existing discontents are fomented by artful and unprincipled agitators, for the worst and most mischievous of purposes, we are unfortunately convinced, that in the perversion of some of our most valuable institutions, in the unequal distribution of public burthens, in the prodigality of public expenditure, in the arbitrary character of some of our laws, and in the corruptions and abuses existing in many departments of Church and State, are to be found the original and extensive sources of dissatisfaction and complaint; we are, therefore, persuaded, that by a prudent and constitutional reform of admitted abuses alone (and especially by a revision of our present system of parliamentary representation) can the designs of the disaffected be defeated, and tranquillity be permanently restored and maintained."

A similar course will, I believe, be adopted, not in one or two other parishes only, but in every other parish of the county, where resolutions in the same spirit will be agreed to. Therefore, if Ministers wish to preserve the lives and property of the King's subjects, they must make retrenchments, and not drive to desperation men of acknowledged loyalty. Violence cannot be put down without removing the cause which produced it. At the present moment, the Ministers are the causes of all these evils; and I have no doubt that the best and most effectual act of Parliament will be, to remove the Ministers.

Sir *R. Peel*:—I deeply regret that the hon. Member has connected two subjects which have not the most remote relation to each other—dissatisfaction with the Government and the legal and acknowledged means of shewing it—and this infamous system of destroying the property of unoffending individuals. I do not believe that he means what he has been stating; and I form that opinion of the construction of his words from communications he has himself made to me. I appeal to the House, whether it was for the hon. Member to hold out even the shadow of a palliation for the late detestable proceedings by arguing that the Ministers are unpopular?

Mr. *Hume*:—I did not.

Sir *R. Peel*:—The hon. Member said, that the best law to put an end to them was to get rid of the Ministers. Whatever he may do, I acquit those who feel dissatisfied with Government of any participation in these infamous acts. I do not believe that there is a thinking man in the community, however opposed to Government, who would participate in these excesses, and who would not join any confederacy to put an end to them. Whatever cause of dissatisfaction there may be, there is a clear distinction between that dissatisfaction, and outrage such as every man laments. The hon. Member states truly, that voluntary associations have been formed in various situations, to take precautions against crimes of this nature; and I apprehend it will be found that Magistrates are empowered, on any reasonable apprehension of meditated felony, to swear in special constables. I am, however, quite ready to consider any further suggestion, by a temporary law, to render that power more effectual. I earnestly recommend, from my experience, the utmost local and personal care; for I believe that these crimes have been frequently committed through the agency of one or two individuals of respectable appearance—so respectable as to disarm suspicion—unconnected with the parish or village where the fire takes place. Such has been the case in more situations than one; and I can suggest nothing but extreme local vigilance, and associations among the inhabitants, to protect their own property. I again repeat, that every measure it may be possible for me to adopt, without local knowledge, shall be adopted. I am prepared to consider any rational law, for any useful purpose.

Mr. *Hume* hoped the House would allow him to explain. The right hon. Baronet had certainly mistaken or misrepresented what he had said. At least, nothing which had fallen from him could have been sufficient to excite much irritation.

Sir *R. Peel* did not think that he misrepresented the hon. Gentleman. But he must have greatly misunderstood him, if he (Mr. Hume) did not say that "no Act of Parliament which they could pass would have any effect in putting down the disaffection, unless it were accompanied by concessions."

Mr. *Hume* said, that it was not the first time that Gentleman had attributed to him language which he had not used, and meanings which he never intended to convey. He could not patiently stand by whilst words were put in his mouth which he had never thought of using. He would repeat what the right hon. Baronet had misrepresented. He had said, that no Act of Parliament would put down the dissatisfaction of the country, unless Ministers showed a sincere determination to retrench. But he had said nothing to countenance the incendiaries. He was as anxious as the Ministers themselves to quell disorder, and to promote the peace of the country.

Sir *R. Peel* disclaimed any intention to misrepresent the language of the hon. member for Middlesex, or to put a false or an unfair construction upon it. If the hon. Gentleman wished the system of the incendiaries to be put down, he (Sir R. Peel) must say, that the observations of the hon. Gentleman were but little calculated to effect that object, and were, at least, ill-timed.

Mr. *H. Sumner* said, that with respect to the observations made by the hon. member for Surrey (Mr. Denison), he felt bound, as a Magistrate of that county, to state that no such feeling as disaffection existed amongst the peasantry. He did not believe that any of the subjects alluded to by another hon. Gentleman—the member for Middlesex—had any influence upon their minds. On one occasion which came under his own observation, the labouring people of the neighbourhood were all anxious to give assistance to the utmost of their power. His object, in the inquiry which he had just made, was to ascertain whether, on an occasion when there existed reasonable grounds for apprehension that mischief was designed, the Magistrates would be justified in adopting strong measures of precaution?

Sir *R. Peel* believed, that some advantage might be gained by making publicly known what is the true state of the law upon that subject. By the Act of 1 Geo. 4th, c. 27, for increasing the power of Magistrates under certain circumstances, it was provided, "that in all cases where it should be made appear, upon the oath of five respectable householders, that any riot or other breach of the peace had taken place, or was likely to take place, the Magistrates may, by precept in writing, call on any number of householders to act as special constables, whenever they, the Magistrates shall see fit and necessary; in which case it is competent to the Justices at the Sessions to order the expenses incurred by such appointment of constables to be paid by a rate upon the county." Now according to that law, when the Magistrates are satisfied that reasonable grounds exist for suspecting that incendiary acts are meditated, they are empowered to appoint constables, and charge the expenses to the county.

Sir *J. E. Brydges* observed, that in these perilous times, when two branches out of three of the Legislature were new, England could not do otherwise than expect "every man to do his duty." He entirely approved of his Majesty's most gracious Speech. It breathed only peace and economy. He contended that it was warping and twisting the plain meaning of words to say, that his Majesty contemplated interference with other States. He would contend also, against the hon. member for Yorkshire that the terms without reserve, did not convey the meaning that hon. Member attributed to them. [*The House manifested impatience.*] He would not occupy the time of the House unnecessarily, but he was determined never to be put down by noise. He was sure there was but one opinion as to the unparalleled outrages which had for some time past disgraced some parts of the country. He had no doubt that Gentlemen, on whatever side they might usually sit in that House, would, in their respective counties, use all their energies to put them down.

Committee upon the Civil List.] The Chancellor of the Exchequer moved, "that the Order of the Day be read, that the House do go into a Committee upon the Civil List;" whereupon

Sir *H. Parnell* said, he rose, according to the notice which he had given on Friday evening last, to move for an inquiry into the details of the expenditure comprehended in those papers which the right hon. Gentleman opposite had explained to the House as the Civil List. When the Ministers of the Crown came down to that House with a claim for a large sum of money for the public service, he could not be persuaded that such a claim ought not to be thoroughly examined in its details. He was in the House on Friday last; he paid the utmost attention in his power to the statements of the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer; since that time he had had many opportunities of discussing the subject with other Gentlemen more competent to form a judgment upon such a subject; he had read the papers laid before the House; but by no application had he been able to comprehend the propositions to which he and the House were called on by the right hon. Gentleman to assent. The right hon. Gentleman had announced a saving of 85,000*l.* in one account. But how that saving was effected he (Sir H. Parnell) had yet been unable to discover. In another place he stated that an additional saving of 150,000*l.* was to be effected. But it appeared to him that never was statement more unfounded. He had the utmost difficulty to discover where that saving, or the other saving of 85,000*l.* was to be looked for. He could not conceive why the right hon. Gentleman made the accounts so complicated, by departing from the old practice of separating the Civil Lists for Ireland and for Scotland from that for England, and dividing them into classes. By the arrangement adopted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, no means were left for ascertaining in what part of the public expenditure the boasted savings were effected. He (Sir Henry Parnell) had looked carefully over the papers, and he could discover no greater saving than that of 27,000*l.*; but the right hon. Gentleman had so managed the accounts as to give an appearance of saving where in reality there was none. He did not mean to make any charge against the right hon. Gentleman; but he thought it a matter into which the House ought seriously to make inquiries, whether the saving of 85,000*l.* were real or not. With regard to the saving which they had been told was to be effected, in addition to that 85,000*l.*, by the giving up of the allowance which his present Majesty had received as Duke of Clarence, surely the Ministers did not mean to claim credit to themselves for any saving which might accrue to the nation from such a source; or, if they did, certainly it ought not to be in the Civil List they claimed credit for it, as that allowance was paid out of the Consolidated Fund. But, in the papers brought forward by the right hon. Gentleman, the House and the nation were given to understand that the saving was deducted from the Civil List. Finding that error in the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he had every reason to suspect that a more rigid examination than he had been able to make would detect other errors in them. The saving of 15,000*l.* from certain contingencies had nothing to do with the Civil List, which the House had then to consider. Such a deduction, therefore, ought not to have been introduced for the purpose of swelling the balance in favour of the Civil List now proposed, in comparison with former lists. The Chancellor of the Exchequer takes credit also, at present, for contingent reductions in the Irish Pension List, which he merely anticipates, leaving it to chance to bring in the savings to the Treasury. With respect to the saving, therefore, represented as amounting to 85,000*l.*, it seemed very doubtful whether a great part of that had any more reality than the savings in the Irish Pensions. Nor could that which was said to be an additional saving of 35,000*l.*, caused by the falling in of the allowance of the Duke of Clarence, be considered a saving in the Civil List. Taking all these things together, it could not be doubted that there existed an urgent necessity for the House to make a rigid inquiry. It was, to say the least of it, a very strong measure on the part of the Ministers, to call upon that House to give them 970,000*l.* without inquiry as to the purposes to which it was to be applied, but yielding that sum to their control in simple confidence. The House ought not to neglect what was its own proper duty, and take the word of any Minister for the application of the public money. He wished to state, that in the motion which he should have the honour to propose, he had no intention, the most remote, to interfere in any way with the expenses necessary for the comfort, dignity, or splendor of the Sovereign. Gentlemen were well aware, that the line of distinction could easily and fairly be drawn. For, out of ten classes of expenditure into which the Civil List then presented was divisible, there were but three which could be said to have any relation to the comfort, dignity, or splendor of the Crown. Those three amount to about 450,000*l.*, and even in that sum expenses are provided for, which do not affect the King's personal comfort or the royal dignity. The other and larger part of the whole amount of the Civil List—so great a sum as 480,000*l.*, comprising expenses of an entirely national and public character—the other and larger part of the whole sum was, in every respect, of as public a nature as any sums that were applied for and granted in that House. It was required for services quite distinct from the personal wants of the Crown. Why did the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer seek to obtain those sums without inquiry or explanation, which he would be compelled to give if they were brought forward like other charges for the public service? He would ask Gentlemen who came to that House, with promises of economy fresh upon their lips, whether they would grant the vast sums applied for without the inquiry for which he called? It could not be doubted that inquiry would at least be satisfactory to their constituents, and there was reason to suppose that it might also be beneficial. It was too much that they should, immediately upon their meeting, vote away 1,000,000*l.* of the public money—short, perhaps, of some 30,000*l.*—without being able to say to what purposes that great sum was to be applied. With respect to the expenses of the Royal Household, he had every wish to grant an adequate allowance. But with respect to that class in the Civil List which comprised the pensions, he thought it extremely important that it should be submitted to strict investigation. Was it not necessary to inquire why the English Pension List was kept up to 74,000*l.*, the Irish to 54,000*l.*, and the Scotch to 32,000*l.*? Was the House now going to vote permanently the sum of 160,000*l.*, for such purposes, at such a period, and without inquiry? He would beg leave to remind the House of the opinion of the whole country regarding pensions. According to the papers furnished to the Finance Committee, the sum paid for English pensions of every kind was 717,000*l.*; adding the Irish and Scotch pensions of every kind, the sum was increased to 772,000*l.* There was also a very heavy charge for superannuation; the sum being, for the Civil service of the State alone, 480,000*l.*; to this must be added the pensions paid under the denomination of half-pay, amounting to 4,900,000*l.* Besides, there were pensions of another kind fixed by law, so that the pensions altogether amounted to upwards of 6,000,000*l.* sterling, one shilling of which could not be touched without a compromise of the national faith. But with the full knowledge of all those burthens, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, having the power to diminish them, proposed that they should agree to continue pensions to the amount of 160,000*l.* per year. To him that circumstance seemed to require investigation, and therefore he proposed a Committee. A Committee, he was sure, would be able to reduce those pensions very considerably without lessening the King's dignity, or staining his honour. With regard to the expenses of Ministers at foreign courts—although the charge in the Civil List now brought forward was less by 27,000*l.* than in that of 1820, the country was still called on to pay, under that head, 186,000*l.* But he could not help thinking that there was room in that item for very considerable reduction. At all events the sum claimed for that part of the list was too great to be voted by that House without inquiry. He objected, for example, to giving the Ambassador at the Netherlands 8,000*l.* a year besides an allowance for a house and various other charges. He objected also to the large salaries given to ambassadors and plenipotentiaries at several other courts and the whole of the diplomatic expenditure required revision and reduction. He wanted also to have an inquiry into the Irish and Scotch Pension Lists for although there had been Committees of Inquiry into the English Pension List, there had never been an inquiry respecting the Irish and Scotch Pensions. Money was voted, and it was never known to whom it went. The case required to be looked into. Indeed, as for Scotland, every particular connected with the Civil List, and also the hereditary revenues of the Crown in that part of the kingdom, called for investigation. In 1820, the sum of 109,000*l.* a year was given in lieu of the hereditary revenues of the Crown in Scotland. But out of the whole produce, amounting to 184,000*l.*, no more than 27,000*l.* found its way into the Exchequer. He would ask, was not that one fact sufficient to establish the necessity of an inquiry? The right hon. Gentleman had attempted to justify the mode in which he had prepared the Civil List by referring to that adopted in 1820; and to his (Sir H. Parnell's) great surprise, and no doubt to the great surprise of many other Members, the right honourable Chancellor affirmed that the Civil List of 1820 had met the entire approbation of the House. He (Sir H. Parnell) had taken part in the debate upon that occasion; and he had never known a question more disputed than was that of the Civil List of 1820. There was on that occasion a most determined opposition to the proposals of the ministry: 157 Members voted in the minority. The Civil List of 1820 exceeded that of 1760 by the extravagant sum of 415,000*l.* Yet a saving of 87,000*l.* from that extravagant settlement was now called a measure of great economy. The comparison showed that the Ministers had not, on the present occasion, gone down low enough by 100,000*l.*; especially when it was considered that prices now are very much below the prices of that year. If the arrangements of that year had not been most extravagant, the last reign would never have been gone through without a debt having been created. Therefore, when the right hon. Gentleman (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) took so much credit to Ministers on the score of reduction, because they kept below the Civil List of 1820 by so small a sum, the House could see what their notions of economy were. With respect to the separation of those expenses which relate to the comfort and dignity of the Crown from those which are entirely national, he considered that the reasoning of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was strikingly incorrect. The right hon. Gentleman had asked what advantage would be obtained by the separation? It was his (the Chancellor's) duty to show, for the satisfaction of the House, what advantages they were to expect from keeping those accounts together. He ought to satisfy the House that the proposal to which he called on them to assent was justified by common sense. His own practice, in separating other expenses, no more national than some of those still mixed up in the Civil List, proved that even he himself considered such a separation useful. As for the explanation that such had been the practice, he (Sir H. Parnell) reprobated the customs defending bad measures by precedents. What had the nation gained by that practice, of doing all things according to former precedents? The result was, that the nation was burthened with an enormous debt, and oppressed with exorbitant taxation. Reference had been made to the provision for the personal expenditure of the Crown. On that subject he (Sir H. Parnell) believed that nothing could be of greater importance than that there should be no room for misunderstanding throughout the country respecting the sum set apart for the use of the Sovereign. Would any hon. Gentleman say, that there could be any advantage in leaving the matter in doubt, and consequently open to misrepresentation? There were many items now included in the Civil List which ought to be annually brought before that House, as other expenses were brought before them, but that was not the case with the King's personal expenditure. He considered the expenses of the Ministers at foreign courts to be one important item of that kind. Without the separation of those national charges from the personal expenses of the Crown, nothing like a proper system of public accounts could be attained. All sums paid in a particular branch of the public expenditure ought to be paid from a particular fund, and kept in a separate account. If different sums were to be paid for one purpose out of different funds, how could accounts be kept with any regularity? The right hon. Baronet then contrasted the mode of keeping the public accounts in France with that of keeping them in England, and contended that the former was much superior. There the annual revenue was 40,000,000*l.* and yet, by the system employed, there could be neither mistake nor delusion. In England there was not before Parliament any account of the annual expenditure of the country; nor had there been, until a year or two ago, any such account even laid before the Treasury; but he thought that a full and satisfactory account of the public expenditure ought to be regularly laid before the House. Mr. Burke had said, that the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster produced 4,000*l.* a year in money, but they were worth 40,000*l.* a year in influence. If those estates were to be sold, as Mr. Burke recommended, they would greatly benefit the public income. It might, perhaps, be objected to his (Sir H. Parnell's) Motion, that there was no precedent for the appointment of aSelect Committee to inquire respecting the Civil List at the beginning of a new reign. But he thought, that if other Parliaments were willing to give the public money away, without inquiring as to its application, they (the present Parliament) ought not to follow such an example. Inquiries respecting the Civil List had been made by Committees in the years 1803, 1804, and 1815. He should conclude by stating, that if the House supported him in that Motion, he would not attempt to refuse what might be considered necessary for the support of his Majesty's dignity and comfort. He had no doubt, that the King would continue to be what he now was, and deserved to be—one of the most popular Monarchs that ever sat upon the Throne of England.—The House, by going into the Committee, would not impair his dignity, nor decrease his popularity; but they would give to their constituents a pledge of their sincerity in diminishing the burthens of the people. He would entreat hon. Gentlemen, before they refused the Committee for which he asked, to consider how much they owed to those whom they represented in that House, to the national security, and to the Monarch. The right hon. Baronet then moved as an Amendment—"That a Select Committee be appointed to examine the accounts presented to the House by order of his Majesty connected with the Civil List, and to report thereon."

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* said, notwithstanding what had fallen from the hon. Baronet who had just sat down, he still adhered to the opinion which he originally entertained when the subject of the Civil List was first submitted to the House, and which he then expressed; namely, that the proper course was for Government to present to the House estimates of the proposed expenditure and arrangement of the Civil List, rather than to delegate that duty, and the responsibility which it involved, to a Select Committee. He adhered to that opinion, not merely because such had been the usual practice heretofore, but because, even in reference to what the hon. Gentleman considered schemes of economy, he was prepared to maintain that a Select Committee was not calculated to effect any economical object, which it was not perfectly competent to the House, looking at the statements and estimates laid before it, to effect. The hon. Baronet had not very distinctly stated to the House whether he wished the Committee, which he proposed to appoint, to be vested with power to examine witnesses and papers as to the several items of the accounts laid before it, or whether he desired to adhere to the practice previously adopted when committees had been appointed with reference to debts incurred upon the Civil List; namely, that the accounts should be submitted to the Committee for examination, but without power to go into so extensive an investigation, or to call for papers and persons. The hon. Gentleman had not very distinctly stated which of these two courses he meant to suggest.

Sir *H. Parnell* was understood to intimate, that he proposed to appoint a Committee merely possessed of power to examine the accounts laid before it, but not to call for witnesses.

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer.*—The hon. Gentleman now stated that it was not his intention that the proposed committee should have power to examine persons with respect to the items and accounts laid before it, but merely that it should report its opinion on the Civil List. Then, he asked the hon. Baronet, not only in reference to the common sense of the matter, but in reference to opinions expressed by authorities which the hon. Member must revere, because he had long acted with the individuals who had expressed those opinions—he asked the hon.

Baronet what additional means or facilities he could devise to effect a public service, by such a committee which he could not already avail himself of by an examination of the documents now upon the table of the House—an examination which it was perfectly competent to the hon. Baronet, and every Member of the House, to make? Indeed, he recollected that upon former occasions Gentlemen upon the other side of the House had said it would be much better to have papers and accounts connected with the Civil List upon the Table, for the satisfaction of the House, than to refer those documents to a Committee, before which an examination of witnesses should be denied. He referred particularly to the sentiments expressed by the late Mr. Tierney on this subject, who, as the hon. Baronet would readily admit, was one of the most active, intelligent, and acute Members of the House, in reference to all matters of this kind. Indeed he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) thought he had come down provided with an extract from Mr. Tierney's speech upon the subject, but he found he had omitted to bring it; however, he very well remembered that Mr. Tierney said, "he would prefer leaving the papers in the hands of Members to the appointment of a committee without power to call for persons and documents." This was not merely an argument used in the course of debate, with a view to a particular purpose. Mr. Tierney acted in consonance with those sentiments, and when appointed upon a committee vested with such powers as were proposed to be conferred in the present instance, he refused to act, and threw up his seat in it. Such then was the opinion entertained, expressed, and acted on by political friends of the hon. Baronet on the occasion of former discussions of a nature similar to the present. The hon. gentleman did not act in conformity with those opinions when he brought forward his Amendment, and he now put it to the hon. Baronet's candour to say, supposing that instead of laying estimates of the Civil List before the House, as he had done, he had stood there the mover for a Committee such as the hon. Gentleman proposed—he put it to the House whether, in such a case, he should not have been told by Members opposite that he was acting in that way with a view to delude the House and the country, to cover a desire for an extravagant Civil List by the sanction of a powerless committee, and to prevent instead of promoting inquiry? No doubt he should have been met with that argument, and with those reproaches, if he had consented to the appointment of a committee without power to enter into an effective examination of the subject; instead of submitting the details of the Civil List to the House in such a manner that Members could have opportunities of suggesting reductions and modifications, as the Bill proceeded in its respective stages. He said, then, he did not think it consistent with his duty as a Minister of the Crown, nor, indeed, conducive to a proper examination of the subject, to accede to the hon. Baronet's motion. But let the House see what it was that the hon. Gentleman proposed to delegate to a committee, without power to call for and examine persons, papers, and records. Not content with empowering a committee, thus constituted, to go into the whole of the estimates of the Civil List, the hon. Baronet wished it to come to a decision as to the best mode of keeping the public accounts. At least the hon. Gentleman's remarks seemed to tend that way. And not only would the hon. Baronet have the committee investigate the various branches of the Civil List, and the best method of keeping the national accounts, but he wished it also to consider whether it might not be proper to sell the lands belonging to the Duchy of Lancaster, and place the produce of the sale to the credit of the public account. The hon. Baronet further wished, that the Committee should examine into the diplomatic expenses. Was it possible that a committee, going into these extensive and difficult inquiries, yet without power to institute a sufficient examination, should ever effect any good? Was it conceivable that its debates and discussions should ever come to any satisfactory conclusion? or that they would not be so prolonged and delayed as to throw impediments in the way of what it must be the desire of the House to expedite, with a view to the public convenience as well as in reference to the dignity of the Crown? But the hon. Gentleman's arguments for a committee were mainly based upon the statements made in the commencement of his speech. He told the House that he could not discover, on the perusal of the papers laid before the House, where the saving of 85,000*l.* in the present, as compared with the preceding Civil List, was to be found. Having in his hands the paper, containing an account of what transfers had been now made from the Civil List, as formerly granted to his late Majesty to other funds, the hon. Baronet nevertheless inquired whether the fees proposed to be reduced were not to be deducted from the saving of 85,000*l.* He referred the hon. Gentleman to page 25 of "Accounts and Estimates of the Civil List," where he would find the whole amount of the income of his late Majesty George 4th stated at 1,221,632*l.*; and then followed certain charges from which the Civil List would be relieved in future—a reduction of items, by the way, which were not savings, but transferred to other funds. In England, a sum of 108,945*l.* was transferred; in Ireland, 43,698*l.*; and the deduction of charges from the hereditary revenue of Scotland was 13,540*l.*; making a total from which the Civil List was relieved of 166,184*l.* But, as already stated, these were not savings, but sums transferred, and in the account the reader was referred to three or four preceding papers for the details. It appeared that the whole sum enjoyed by his late Majesty from the Civil List, &c., was 1,221,632*l.*; deducting from this amount 166,184*l.* now transferred from the Civil List, the balance was 1,055,448*l.*; but the estimated amount of the probable future charge was 970,000*l.*, leaving a diminution of charge, after providing for the Queen—a clear saving upon the last Civil List—of 85,448*l.* Let the hon. Baronet go through the various classes of the Civil List as now proposed, and he would see the items on which the saving was effected. In a committee the hon. Gentleman would have nothing but the papers now upon the Table, without power of examining witnesses, and without the opportunity of having any difficulties in the statements cleared up by the Chancellor of the Exchequer's explanations. Under such circumstances, no additional information could be afforded by the committee for which the hon. Member asked. The next object to which the hon. Baronet appeared to refer, as constituting a ground for the appointment of a committee, was an examination of the fitness of retaining the present amount of pensions charged upon the Civil List. But how could the hon. Member obtain fuller information or better grounds for discussion in a committee than were already afforded by the papers before the House; in addition to which, pension-lists were in preparation, and would shortly be laid on the Table in pursuance of a motion of the hon. member for Middlesex. Thus the House would have in its own hands the means of judging of the nature and amount of pensions as fully as any committee, which committee would not possess the power of examining witnesses. As far as the question of economy was concerned, the hon. Gentleman could gain no advantage by the appointment of a committee; for that object might as well be promoted by a proposition for a reduction of pensions in the committee upon the Bill. He might content himself with leaving the question of pensions with this single observation, but as the hon. Gentleman had expressed a decided opinion as to the enormous amount of the pensions at the disposal of the Crown, he would only ask the hon. Member to refer to antecedent periods, and observe how small a proportion the pension list now at the disposal of the Crown bore to that which formerly existed. When Mr. Burke proposed to limit the English pension-list to 95,000*l.*, it was with a view to economy, and a great reduction. But the amount of pensions upon the English Civil List was now estimated at a much lower sum (74,000*l.*) The Irish pension-list was now only 50,000*l.*; before the Union it amounted to 146,000*l.* The Scotch pension-list also stood antecedently at a considerably larger amount than at present. If the hon. Gentleman was disposed to comment on the amount of the pension list now at the disposal of the Crown, he must not call it extravagant, as compared with the pension-lists of former periods, but must at once admit that great was the reduction effected in that branch of expenditure. But the next reason why the hon. Baronet was desirous of going into a committee appeared to be, for the purpose of examining into the salaries of foreign ministers. Why not examine the amount of those salaries at present, and at once enter into a discussion as to whether they could be more or less reduced? All the details were before the hon. Member. He could therefore go into the merits of the case. What advantage would the hon. Baronet derive from examining the question of the salaries of the Ambassadors in a room up stairs, instead of investigating the subject in a room in his own residence, and then bringing the matter before the House? The hon. Member said, and said truly, that our expenditure on account of foreign ministers was increased in 1820. He was ready to admit the fact, but was prepared to maintain that the circumstances of the time—the increased number of Ministers—the augmentation made in the allowances of the Ambassadors of other States—the additional expense imposed on our foreign ministers—all rendered an increased expenditure in this department necessary. But though the present amount of our foreign expenditure was greater than formerly, efforts had been systematically made to diminish it, and it had been reduced from time to time. These reductions were made by his noble friend at present at the head of the Foreign-office, and by his predecessor, Lord Dudley; and the present estimate was less by 27,000*l.* a-year than at an antecedent period. When the hon. Baronet referred to the expenses of our foreign embassies at a former, as compared with the present period, he ought to have stated how considerably the number of our foreign ministers had been increased of late years. Up to 1826 we had only seventeen ministers at foreign Courts; we had now twenty-five, and all in stations so important that it was absolutely indispensable that communications should be kept up with them in this way. In the new States of South America a great augmentation of expense had been necessarily incurred by diplomatic missions, and yet, notwithstanding the increase in number, his noble friend had been able to bring this branch of expenditure within the estimate of 1816, for the maintenance of seventeen foreign ministers, the number then employed. Thinking, therefore, that a reference of the Civil List to the committee, which the hon. Baronet proposed, could give us no additional means of reducing our expenditure, he opposed the Motion. He also opposed it because he thought it proper for Government to incur the responsibility of bringing forward the Civil List, instead of shifting the burthen upon a committee. He wished to say a few words in reply to the hon. Gentleman's observations upon his speech on a former evening, when he introduced the subject to the notice of the House. He denied the conclusion to which the hon. Baronet had come with respect to the Civil List of 1815. The hon. Gentleman overturned his own proposition for the appointment of a committee, for he said that in 1815-16 we fixed a Civil List on the largest possible scale; but was that Civil List framed without the aid of a committee previously appointed? By no means? Could the hon. Baronet not object with propriety to a Civil List constructed with the assistance of a committee? That was inconsistent with his argument for the appointment of a committee at present. Yet, if the hon. Baronet's opinion as to the excessive amount of that Civil List were correct, we stood a better chance now of arriving at a fair conclusion without a committee than with one. The hon. Baronet seemed to tax him with alluding to the circumstance of there having been no debt upon the late Civil List, and the hon. Member argued, that the fact of no debt being incurred was a proof of extravagance in the Civil List. What did the hon. Baronet consider the circumstance of incurring debts to be? Was it a piece of extravagance to run into or keep out of debt? If a man kept within the limits of his income, was he extravagant, or was his income of necessity enormous? And if he ran into debt, was he the contrary of extravagant, and was his income necessarily limited? If the hon. Baronet argued in this way, he confessed he knew not by what process of reasoning it was possible to answer him. The last argument alluded to by the hon. Gentleman was in reference to a separation of that part of the Civil List, relating to the personal expenditure of the Crown, from those parts which belonged more peculiarly to other branches of the Government of the country; and the hon. Baronet said, he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had stated no reason why he should not depart from the usual practice in this case. He should think that the practice that had uniformly prevailed in the country in this respect, was one which it would not be wise to depart from, even at the present time, when innovation was the fashion. But the hon. Gentleman's rule appeared to be, that all past practices were uniformly and invariably bad, and that we never could be in error if we departed from them. He could not allow the soundness of this doctrine. If the honourable Baronet had pointed out the regular course of practice which had been heretofore adopted on such occasions as the present, and called on the House to follow it, then he could understand the proceeding: but the hon. Baronet had acted in a manner directly contrary. He had before stated, in explicit terms, that balancing all the arguments which could be brought to bear on this question, it was better in his opinion to retain the Civil List in its present form, and on its existing foundation, than to proceed in the way which the hon. Baronet recommended. The hon. Baronet said, in the first place, that the expense of the Civil List, under the existing system, gave to the ill-disposed throughout the country an opportunity of declaiming about his Majesty's enormous income, which they would suppose amounted to upwards of 1,000,000*l.* a year,—an expenditure that was calculated, in the minds of persons ignorant of the fact, to create an objection against the royal authority. Now he could not agree with the hon. Baronet in his view of the subject. If individuals recurred to the documents and statements which had been produced relative to the Civil List, they must see sufficient to correct this mistaken idea. And he must repeat, that the King did not enjoy the whole of the provision made by Parliament,—it was not all merged in his personal expenditure, but a very large portion of it was appropriated to other and very distinct purposes. Then, he contended, that if they confined the Civil List to what was necessary for private and personal purposes—if they were to pare it down to 500,000*l.*, they would just create the very sort of feeling as to the amount of income, which the hon. Baronet was anxious to prevent. What, he asked, would be the impression on the public mind—what would be the feeling of those individuals who objected to the grant of 1,000,000*l.*. partly for private, and partly for public purposes—if they were told that 500,000*l.* a-year was to be appropriated to the former object alone? He was perfectly convinced that it would have the effect, the decided effect of bringing the Monarch into oboloquy. What would the people say when they were told that the Monarch had 500,000*l.* a-year for his own private and personal gratification? What would they think when they heard that no public service was mixed up with this grant—but that it was wholly devoted to the private and personal gratification of his Majesty? He would maintain that such a course was more likely to injure the monarchy, and was more calculated to bring it into obloquy and distrust than the existing system. But the hon. Baronet had another reason for wishing to exclude the Ambassadors from the Civil List. He wished that the House should have annually an opportunity of declaring whether or not a Minister should be sent to this Court and to that country. If such were to be the result of the hon. Baronet's proposition, he hesitated not to say, that he looked on it, not as likely to be advantageous, but greatly injurious, to the real power and political greatness of the country. It was not for that House to say whether political relations should be kept up with one Power or another. The Constitution had wisely placed that authority in the hands of the Crown. He would not detain the House with any further observations; but convinced as he was, that no other system was so proper as that which had been proposed by Ministers, he should meet the Motion of the hon. Baronet by a decided negative.

Mr. *Bankes* said, that Ministers having laid before the House, as was customary on former occasions, an Estimate of what appeared to them to be necessary for the Civil List, he could see no reason why the documents connected with the subject should not be submitted to a Select Committee. That certainly was the most commodious way in which the House could become acquainted with all the details of the question. He was not aware of the use or benefit of that sort of mystery which was attempted to be thrown over this important subject. How, he asked, could it be advantageous to the Crown, or satisfactory to the country? In his opinion, this subject ought to be clearly brought within the sphere of the intelligence of that House—as, indeed, every thing connected with the finance of the country ought to be. It was the more necessary that this subject should undergo investigation in a committee, because, according to the showing of the right hon. Gentleman himself, there was a new classification of the Civil List, with reference to certain points. They were told that some parts of the Civil List were to be taken away, and that certain new arrangements were to be made. If that were so, where could those alterations be so well considered as in a committee? There could not possibly be a subject more fit to be investigated and determined by Gentlemen above stairs. The point which the right hon. Gentleman last noticed had reference to foreign Ministers. He knew that that subject had been formerly debated, and he confessed, that he had not, as yet, formed a decided opinion, whether the expense of foreign ministers should continue to be charged on the Civil List, or whether it should be differently provided for. He was anxious that the inconvenience which resulted from the running in debt of the Crown, with reference to this and other charges, should be completely avoided. In touching on this point, he must be allowed to observe, that no one had argued, in the course of the debate, that that House should assume the right of declaring with what Power this country should, or should not, keep up political relations by means of Ambassadors. He would ask whether the explanation given on the subject of the Civil List by Ministers was so perfectly clear that Parliament ought to be satisfied with it? He did not think that it was, and he was quite sure that a great deal of useful information might be derived from an inquiry in a committee. When the proposition for a committee was opposed, he called on hon. Members to point out the inconvenience of it; and if they could not do that, he contended that they were not justified in opposing it.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer's arguments, had confirmed him in the opinion that the question ought to be referred to a committee, and he, therefore, should vote for the right hon. Baronet's Motion.

Mr. *Calcraft* was not aware, that any committee, on an occasion of this kind, when provision was about to be made to support the dignity of the Crown, had ever been appointed to act as assessors. The committee to which the hon. Baronet had particularly alluded was appointed by that House in order to give satisfaction to the country, by endeavouring to effect some relief of its burthens. It was under these circumstances that the appointment of that committee took place. But how did they stand with respect to the Civil List? The amount of that List was settled in 1815, and, from 1820, when his late Majesty succeeded to the Throne, up to the present moment, that Civil List had been found sufficient for its purpose. No debt had been incurred—no additional charge had taken place,—and yet, when his Majesty's Ministers proposed, not an increase to the Civil List as it now stood, but an absolute reduction, as his right hon. friend had shown, of 85,000*l.*, and in addition to that, by certain transfers, a farther diminution of 50,000*l.* making a total of 135,000*l.*, they were called on to submit the whole question to a committee. In making this statement, he of course did not touch upon the cessation of the allowance to the Duke of Clarence, because he could not consider it as arising out of any economical arrangement. He stood there to speak his opinion freely, and he was astonished that any man, conversant with figures, could state the case otherwise than he had done. The allowance to the Duke of Clarence was a saving, but it certainly did not arise out of any economical arrangement. They had now, for the first time, to deal with a Civil List, which, during an experience of sixteen years, had not run in debt; on that List his right hon. friend proposed to make a very considerable reduction; yet the hon. Baronet, notwithstanding this, said, "We ought to submit the subject to a committee." He did not wish the committee to consider those points which had reference to the personal splendor of the Crown, but he wanted them to apply themselves to other items and articles which were included in the Civil List. Now, whether, it would, or would not, be better to divide those items from the others, and to leave them to be annually voted by Parliament—whether it would, or would not be better, for Parliament to confine itself to voting that which was necessary to the splendor of the Crown for life—this, he confessed, was a point on which he had not entirely made up his mind, as his right hon. colleague had done. He stated what he thought and felt, as it was his duty to do; and if he spoke more explicitly than others, such conduct he was sure would not be met with disapprobation. The hon. Baronet admitted that the worst thing that could be done was, to grant the Crown so little as to render it liable to be involved in debt, and thus to compel it to apply to Parliament for further provision; and yet the hon. Baronet was not content to take the Civil List, which had answered during a trial of sixteen years, on which a considerable saving was proposed, but he called also for a committee. He saw no necessity for such a committee, and he should vote against it. He did not think, the splendor and dignity of the Crown being provided for, that a reduction in the other items ought to be made by a committee up-stairs in preference to its being the act of the House itself. Reductions might be made in the course of examinations in that House, and it ought to be recollected, that this measure must go through a great number of stages before it was perfected.

Lord *Althorp* observed, that when the right hon. Gentleman alluded to the fact of Mr. Tierney's having refused, on one occasion, to serve on a committee, because it was not empowered to examine persons, papers, and records, it did not, in his mind, bear strongly against the argument of his hon. friend. He did not mean to urge it personally against his right hon. friend, who had just sat down, that in 1815 he supported the proposition which was then made, and to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had alluded; but he wished to observe, that at the commencement of a new reign, in 1820, his right hon. friend was one of 157 who voted for the extensive motion of Lord John Russell, the object of which was to refer the Civil List Estimates to a committee, that they might be properly examined, though he opposed such a course now. It was his wish and the wish of his honourable friends near him to have a committee, because they were of opinion that they ought to compare the items of the present scale with those which had formerly been submitted to Parliament. The right hon. Gentleman told them, that the proposed reduction was to be found in page 25 of the papers. He knew that; but the House could only see it there in the lump, and not in particulars, as he wished to be made acquainted with it. If they agreed to the reduction without entering into particulars, they were likely to fall into considerable error. It was quite impossible for them, without a more detailed examination than could be had in the House, to arrive at an accurate decision. It was said, that they could come to no satisfactory conclusion unless the committee had leave to send for persons, papers, and records. Such a permission would, he knew, be a very great increase of power; but could no information be afforded, if that power were refused? He admitted, that a great degree of delicacy ought to be observed with respect to certain heads of the Civil List. For his own part, he felt no desire to examine closely into them: on the contrary, he wished not to have such a power. But with respect to many other heads, to which no such feeling of delicacy attached, he conceived that much valuable information might be elicited, and therefore he would support the Motion of his hon. friend. There were many points, in the other items, that required explanation; and certainly it was proper that the House should have the means of arriving at a clear understandiag of the whole matter. He was of opinion, that those items should undergo a thorough examination, which would render the subject more clear and tangible than the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, or the papers that had been laid on the Table; for after attending to the observations of the right hon. Gentleman and his friends, he could not see in what way the diminution of expense, to the amount of 85,000*l.* was made. There was nothing in the papers which had been laid before them that explained that point; and he conceived that it would be highly improper for that House to vote 970,000*l.* a-year for the whole of his Majesty's reign without due inquiry. To call on them to vote such sum without entering into the details, in order that they might see in what manner that money was to be applied, appeared to him so monstrous a demand, that he was astonished how the Government could make it; and till he had heard it he did not conceive it possible that any Government should have proposed to draw so largely on the faith of the Parliament. He hoped the House would not place quite so much confidence. The right hon. Gentleman said, that by coming down and moving for a committee of this kind, Members interfered with the constitutional authority of the Ministers of the Crown. He never wished to do that. But he could not help feeling that it was not right for Ministers merely to make a statement—and that not a clear one—and then, at once, without further consideration, to make such a proposition as this to the House. He thought that the country would have a very great and just right to complain, after the pledges on the subject of economy and retrenchment, which many Members of that House had given to their constituents, if they voted the Civil List without proper examination and inquiry. For these reasons he should vote for the Motion of his hon. friend. His hon. friend could not possibly intend to go into a general and minute detail of the household items. Certainly not; he believed his hon. friend meant no such thing. But his hon. friend felt, as he did, that there were many items which ought not to be mixed up with the Civil List. One of the arguments against the appointment of a committee was, that it might give rise to misrepresentation. He was of opinion that it would have precisely the contrary effect; and he was anxious, in order that the public might be strictly informed on the subject that a separation of certain items from the Civil List should be effected.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* said, it had been contended, that, on former occasions, no such committee as that now called for was appointed. Now, allowing that argument to take its full course, he should only say, in answer to it, that it was no reason, because preceding Houses of Parliament had neglected their duty, that the present Parliament should therefore neglect its duty. But they were told that no committee was appointed at the accession of George 3rd. Why, he asked, was that? Because one gross sum was voted for the total amount of the Civil List, and no statement was laid before Parliament. The Parliament, at that time, was perfectly ignorant as to what part of the grant was applied to the personal splendor of the Monarch; what part to the salary of foreign ministers, or what part to defray the expense of public functionaries at home. At that period it was not the custom for Parliament to inquire into the subject. The first instance of inquiry was that introduced by Mr. Burke, when he divided the Civil List into different classes. A new principle was then established; and from that period, and from that period only, were they to date the examination of the Civil List. At the commencement of the last reign, a proposition for the appointment of a committee to inquire into the Civil List was negatived. When, however, his Majesty Geo. 3rd died, it was necessary to place the establishment at Windsor on a new footing. With that view a committee upstairs was appointed. He (Mr. Wynn) served on that committee, with his hon. friend the member for Dorsetshire. That committee had not power to send for papers, persons, and records; but Lord Castlereagh was a member of it; and it was but doing justice to his noble friend to say, that he gave every information in his power. He allowed every member of that committee to come down to the House, and to use the information which he had received in the committee as a ground for requiring more if it were necessary. That committee examined most minutely into the Windsor establishment, and it made a report on which the House acted. The estimate for Windsor was, on several points, curtailed by that committee. The number of Equerries was reduced, as being unnecessarily large. A Motion was afterwards made by a gallant Officer to restore the number, but the House adhered to the recommendation of the committee. He believed that feelings of delicacy made it unpleasant to some Gentlemen at that time to go into such an inquiry; but, in his opinion, no such circumstances existed at present.

Mr. *Herries* who rose amidst loud cries of "Question," said, he could assure Gentlemen that he did not mean to detain them long. His right hon. friend (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had placed on so clear a ground, the reasons which ought to induce the House to adopt the course which he recommended on this occasion—he had so fully supported his proposition by undeniable precedents and conclusive arguments—that it was quite unnecessary for him to enter at any length on a repetition of that which had been so ably stated by his right hon. friend. The hon. Baronet had taken a very short way of enforcing his proposition. He had laid down a principle perfectly new, and to him it appeared no less strange than it was novel. The hon. Baronet contended, not that all precedents ought to be blindly followed, but that they ought to be blindly avoided. The hon. Baronet said—"Because these precedents are established, let us shun them—let us adopt some other system, of which parliamentary history affords no example." Now, if the hon. Baronet carried that doctrine further, if he introduced it when great constitutional principles were debated, it must inevitably lead to revolution. He, however, contended, that they were bound to look to precedents; if they did not, they were likely to plunge into the deepest confusion. They ought now to pursue the same course which had heretofore been adopted on all occasions when the question of fixing the Civil List came under the cognizance of Parliament. There was a new accession to the Throne, and the acknowledged course was, to make a proper provision for the King without the intervention of a committee. Since the time of William 3rd, the necessary sum was invariably voted without any previous inquiry by a committee. What was the object to be gained by this delicate inquiry? Unless a case were made out, proving the difficulty of understanding the subject, there was no ground for requiring this detailed examination. No man, who applied his mind to the accounts laid on the Table, could fail to make himself master of them much better than he was likely to do by the labours of a committee. The difference between the Civil List now proposed, and that which formerly existed, was as clear as figures could make it; and he should be sorry if a Committee of that House were appointed to investigate and examine accounts which were perfectly plain. There was, on the face of the papers, a saving of 135,000*l.* a-year, and no examination by a committee would render that fact more clear or more manifest. Reference had been made to the manner in which the public accounts were kept in another country. He would not say that some improvement might not be made in the mode of keeping the accounts, but he must say, that Statesmen of the country alluded to had complained that the accounts were not kept as clear there as they were here. In one thing the hon. Member would see that there was a striking difference in favour of economy, as respected this country. In that country, a revenue of 37,000,000*l.* was collected at an expense of 5,200,000*l.*, while in this a revenue of 59,000,000*l.* was collected at an expense of only 3,700,000*l.* Reverting to the question before the House, he must say that hon. Members on the other side had failed to assign any good ground why the precedents of former reigns should be departed from. If the Crown applied for aid, it would be a proper occasion for the appointment of a committee; but in the case before the House, he thought that sufficient information had been given on all the items to enable it to proceed without inquiry, and on these grounds he would oppose the Motion for the Committee.

Mr. *Holme Sumner* said, that the noble Lord (Althorp) had stated, that most of the Members had given pledges to their constituents to vote for economy. He had given no pledge, but he felt himself bound as much as those who had, to do his duty by his constituents and the country. He owned he was grievously disappointed at the speech of the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He had said that there was a saving of 135,000*l.*, but when they added the 50,000*l.* for the Queen, without subtracting the 38,000*l.* which ought to be deducted as the allowance of the Duke of Clarence, the thing was not fairly stated. Between the 38,000*l.* which was allowed to the Duke of Clarence, and the 50,000*l.* allowed for the Queen, there was only a difference of 12,000*l.*, which, added to 85,000*l.*, was the whole amount of the saving, and this was much less than the country had a right to expect. Under these circumstances, he would not only support the Amendment for the Committee, but if the hon. Bart. had moved to send for persons, papers, and records, he would also support him, except on the first three items of the Civil List. These he would except out of delicacy to the Sovereign, but on all the other parts of the expenditure he would support the fullest inquiry. He entirely concurred in what was said, that other accounts not properly belonging to it should not be heaped on the Civil List.

The House then divided on the original Motion: For it 204; Against it 233; Majority 29. The announcement of the numbers was received with loud cheers by the Opposition side of the House.

The Amendment on Sir H. Parnell's Motion was then put and agreed to.*

Mr. *Hobhouse* asked the right hon. Secretary of State, whether, after such an expression of the opinion of the House, it was the intention of Ministers to retain their places, and continue to carry on the business of Government.

No answer was given.

Mr. *Hobhouse* said, that he would take an opportunity of bringing the question to an issue [*cries of "Move, move."*]

Mr. *Brougham* said, that the question put by his hon. friend was, under the circumstances, very natural; but he thought at present it was premature. He would take this opportunity of suggesting to his right hon. friend (Sir H. Parnell) whether it would not be better to postpone the appointment of the Committee till to-morrow [*cries of "Now, now," were loudly repeated from the Opposition side;*] and Mr. Brougham withdrew his suggestion.

---

* While the Members who went out for the Amendment remained in the lobby, Mr. Brougham addressed them, and requested them not to go away after the division; for that if they were defeated on that Amendment, it was the intention of the hon. member for Dorsetshire to move another for the appointment of a Committee to inquire into all the items of the Civil List after the first three. This notice was received with cheers.

The Committee appointed.

The following are given as the Lists of the Majority, Minority, and Absentees.

MAJORITY.

Acland, Sir T. D.
Adeane, H. J.
Acheson, Lord
Althorp, Viscount
Anson, Sir G.
Arcedeckne, A.
Astley, Sir J. D.
Attwood, M.
Baillie, J. E.
Bainbridge, E. T.
Bankes, H.
Baring, F.
Baring, Wm. B.
Baring, Sir Thomas
Baring, F. Jun.
Bateson, Sir R.
Benett, John
Bentinck, Lord W. G.
Bernal, R.
Bethel, R.
Biddulph, R. M.
Blake, Sir F.
Blaney, C. D.
Blandford, Marquis
Blount E.
Bouverie, S. P. P.
Brabazon, Lord
Bradshaw, J.
Briscoe, J.
Brougham, J.
Brougham, H.
Browne, W.
Browne, J.
Brownlow, Charles
Buck, L. W.
Bunbury, Sir H. E.
Burke, Sir J.
Burrell, Sir C. M.
Burrell, W.
Byng, G.
Calthorpe, F. G.
Calvert, N.
Campbell, Hon. G. P.
Carter, J. B.
Cavendish, Wm.
Chapman, M. L.
Cholmeley, M. J.
Churchill, Lord C. S.
Clinton, C. J. F.
Colborne, N. W. R.
Curteis, H. B.
Dawson, A.
Davies, T. H. H.
Denison, W. J.
Denman, T.
Dick, Q.
Dickinson, W.
Douglas, W. R. K.
Duncombe, T. S.
Duncombe, A.
Duncombe, W.
Dundas, C.
Dundas, T.
Ebrington, Viscount
Ellice, E.
Ellis, G. J. W. A.
Encombe, Lord
Estcourt, T. G. B. jun.
Euston, Earl of
Evans, W.
Fardell, I.
Farrand, R.
Ferguson, R. C.
Fitzgerald, Lord W.
Fitzgibbon, R. H.
Fitzroy, Lord J.
Foley, E. T.
Foley, T. H.
Folkes, Sir W. J. H. B.
Fordwich, Lord
Fortescue, G. M.
Frankland, Robert
Fyler, T. B.
Gisborne, T.
Gordon, R.
Graham, Sir J. R. G.
Graham, Sir S.
Grant, C.
Grant, Robert
Grattan, James
Guest, J. J.
Guise, Sir W., Bart.
Gurney, B. H.
Harris, G.
Harvey, D. W.
Heathcote, Sir W.
Heron, Sir R.
Hobhouse, J. C.
Hodges, T. L.
Hodgson, J.
Howard, W.
Howard, P. H.
Howard, H.
Howard, R.
Howick, Viscount
Hughes, W. H.
Hume, J.
Ingilby, Sir W. A.
Jephson, C. D. O.
Jerningham, H. V. S.
Johnston, J.
Keck, G. A. L.
Kenyon, L.
Kennedy, T. F.
Kerrison, Sir E.
Killeen, Lord
King, General
Knatchbull, Sir E.
Knight, Robert
Labouchere, Henry
Lamb, G.
Lambert, J. S.
Langston, J. H.
Lawley, Fras.
Leader, N. P.
Lee, Lee, J.
Lefevre, C. S.
Lefroy, A.
Lefroy, T.
Legh, T.
Lennox, Lord J. G.
Lester, B. L.
Littleton, Edward J.
Lumley J. S.
Macauley, T. B.
Macdonald, Sir J.
Mackintosh, Sir J.
Malcolm, N. jun.
Mandeville, Viscount
Marjoribanks, S.
Marshall, W.
Martin, John
Maxwell, H.
Mills, R. W.
M'Namara, W. N.
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, J.
Newark, Lord
Nugent, Lord
O'Connell, Daniel
O'Connor, O.
O'Ferrall, R. M.
Ord, W.
Osborne, Lord F.
Palmer, C. S.
Palmer, R.
Palmer, C. F.
Palmerston, Viscount
Parnell, Sir H.
Patten, J. W.
Pelham, C. A. W.
Penrhyn, E.
Pendarvis, E. W. W.
Philips, G. R.
Ponsonby, Hon. G.
Portman, F. B.
Price, R.
Price, Sir Robert
Pryse, P.
Ramsbottom,
Rice, T. S.
Rickford, W.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Rochford, G.
Robarts, A. W.
Robinson, Sir G.
Robinson, G. R.
Russell, Lord
Rumbold, C. E.
Ruthven, E. S.
Ryder, G. D.
Sadler, M. T.
Sanford, E. A.
Sandon, Viscount
Schonswar, G.
Sebright, Sir J. S.
Sefton, Earl of
Seymour, Lord
Sibthorp, C. D. L. W.
Smith, J. A.
Smith, J.
Smith, R. V.
Stormont, Viscount
Stuart, Lord D. C.
Stuart, William
Stevens, S. L.
Stewart, Sir M. S.
Strutt, E.
Staunton, Sir. G. T.
Stanley, Lord
Stanley, E. G. S.
Stuart, Lord P. J. H.
Sumner, G.H.
Sykes, D.
Taylor, M. A.
Tennyson, C.
Thomson, C. P.
Tomes, J.
Townsend, Lord C. V. F.
Tudor, G.
Tufton, H.
Tullamore, Viscount
Tyrell, J. T.
Tyrell, C.
Valentia, Viscount
Vyvyan, Sir R. R.
Waithman, Ald.
Wall, C. B.
Warburton, H.
Warrender, Sir G.
Watson, Rt. Hon. F.
Webb, Col.
Welby, G. E.
Wellesley, P. T. L.
Western, C. C.
Weyland, J.
White, H.
White, S.
Whitmore, W. W.
Wilks, J.
Wilbraham, G.
Willoughby, H.
Wood,
Wood, C.
Wrottesley, Sir J.
Wrightson, W. B.
Wynn, Sir W. W.
Wynn, C. W. W.
Wyse, T. jun.

MINORITY.

A'Court, E. H.
Agnew, Sir A.
Atkins, J.
Alexander, J. Du Pre

Alexander, J.
Antrobus, G. C.
Arbuthnot, Hon. H.
Arbuthnot, C.
Ashley, Lord
Astell, W.
Baillie, H. D.
Baillie, J.
Baldwin, C. B.
Balford, J.
Bankes, G.
Barne, F.
Bastard, J.
Beckett, Sir J.
Bell, M.
Beresford, M.
Beresford, Sir J. P.
Bernard, Viscount
Blair, W.
Bonham, F. R.
Boyle, J.
Bruce, M.
Brudenell, Lord
Brydges, Sir J. W. H.
Burrard, G.
Calcraft, J.
Calvert, J.
Callaghan, D.
Campbell, A.
Carnegie, Sir J.
Carrington, Sir C. E.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cartwright, W. R.
Cecil, Lord T.
Chichester, Sir A.
Cholmondeley, Lord H. H.
Clerk, Sir G.
Clive, R. H.
Clive, Viscount
Cockburn, Sir G.
Cockerell, Sir C.
Cole, A. H.
Coote, E.
Coote, Sir C.
Cornewall, F. H.
Corry, Viscount
Corry, H. L.
Cotterell, Sir J. G.
Courtenay, T. P.
Cradock, S.
Croker, J. W.
Curzon, R.
Cust, P. F.
Cust, E.
Dalrymple, Sir A. J.
Darlington, Earl of
Dawson, G. R.
Davis, R. H.
Doherty, J.
Douglas, Hon. C.
Dowdeswell, J. E.
Drummond, H. H.
Dugdale, D. S.
Dundas, R. A.
Dundas, W.
East, Sir E. H.
Eastnor, Viscount
Egerton, Sir P. M. G.
Egerton, W.
Egerton, W. T.
Eliot, Lord
Fane, Sir H.
Fergusson, Sir R. A.
Fitzgerald, M.
Fleming, J.
Forbes, Sir C.
Fremantle, Sir T. F.
Gordon, J. A.
Gordon, W.
Gore, W. O.
Goulburn, Rt. Hon. H.
Gower, Lord F. L.
Graham, Lord M. W.
Graham, Marquis
Grant, F. W.
Grant, Sir A.
Gresley, Sir R.
Gunning, Sir R. H.
Hardinge, Sir H.
Hart, G. V.
Hastings, Sir C. A.
Hay, Lord J.
Herries, J. C.
Hill, Sir R.
Hill, Lord A.
Holmes, W.
Hope, H. T.
Hope, J. T.
Hope, Sir A.
Holdsworth, A. H.
Houldsworth, T.
Hoy, J. B.
Irving, J.
Johnstone, J. J. H.
Jones, J.
Kemmis, T. A.
Kilderbee, S. H.
King, R.
Knox, T.
Knox, J. H.
Lee, J. L.
Lewis, T. F.
Lindsay, J.
Loch, J.
Lowther, Viscount
Lushington, J. L.
Mackenzie, Sir J. W.
Mackillop, J.
Mackinnon, C.
Maitland, Viscount
Maitland, A.
Marryat, J.
Martin, Sir T. B.
M'Clintock, J.
Milbank, M.
Miller, W. H.
Monteith, H.
Morison, J.
Munday, F.
Murray, Sir G.
Nicholl, Sir J.
Norreys, Lord
Nugent, Sir G.
O'Brien, W. S.
O'Hara, J.
Palk, Sir L. V.
Pearse, J.
Perceval, S.
Pechell, Sir S. J. B.
Petit, L. H.
Peel, Sir R.
Peel, W. Y.
Philpotts, J.
Phipps, E.
Planta, J.
Pollen, Sir J. W.
Powell, W. E.
Powlett, Lord W. J. F.
Prendergast, M. P.
Pringle, Sir W.
Pringle, Alex.
Price, S. G.
Pusey, P.
Rae, Sir W.
Raine, J.
Reid, Sir J. R.
Rogers, E.
Rose, Sir G. H.
Russell, C.
Scarlett, Sir J.
Scott, Sir S.
Scott, H. F.
Seymour, H. B. S.
Severn, J. C.
Shelley, Sir J.
Shelley, J. V.
Shirley, E. J.
Sidney, Sir P. C.
Smith, Sir C. E.
Smith, S.
Smith, A.
Somerset, Lord G. C. H.
Somerset, Lord R. E. H.
Sotheron, F.
Spottiswoode, A.
Stuart, H. V.
Stanley, W. S.
Strathaven, Lord
Stuart, J.
Sugden, Sir E. B.
Taylor, G. W.
Thompson, Ald.
Thynne, Lord W. Capt.
Tomline, W. E.
Townshend, J. R.
Trench, F. W.
Trevor, G. R.
Trevor, A.
Ure, M.
Valletort, Viscount
Vernon, G. G. V.
Villiers, Lord
Vivian, Sir R. H.
Walpole, J.
West, F. R.
Williams, O.
Winchester, H.
Wortley, Hon. J. S.
Wood, T.
Wortley, Hon. C.

For the Question 204.

Tellers . . { Lord Althorp.
Sir Henry Parnell, bt.

Against the Question 233.

Tellers . . { G. R. Dawson.
Joseph Planta.

Majority for the Question 29.

The following Gentlemen desired to have it known that they were on the spot, but by some accident or other were excluded from voting for Sir H. Parnell's Motion:—

Anson, Hon. Geo.
Brown, Dominick
Chichester, Arthur
Coke, T. W.
Forbes, John
Ferguson, Sir R.
Gregson, John
Kemp, T. R.
Mahon, O'Gorman
O'Grady, Col.
Russell,
Whitbread, W. H.

Of this very important division on which the Duke of Wellington resigned his office, the following additional particulars may be found not uninteresting:

MEMBERS ABSENT.

Abercromby, G. R.
Anson, Hon. G.
Apsley, Lord
Archdall, M.
Bankes, W. J.
Baring, A.
Baynton, S. A.
Beaumont, T. W.
Belfast, Earl of
Belgrave, Viscount
Beresford, Lord G. T.
Bernard, T.
Blackett, C.
Borradaile, R.
Bourne, W. S.
Bouverie, D. P.

Boyle, Lord
Bradshaw, R. H.
Brogden, J.
Browne, D.
Bruen, H.
Buller, C.
Buller, J. W.
Bulwer, H. L.
Burdett, Sir F.
Burton, H.
Buxton, J. J.
Buxton, T. F.
Byng, G. S.
Campbell, J.
Campbell, W. F.
Capel, J.
Cavendish, H. F. C.
Cavendish, Lord G.
Cawthorne, J. F.
Chandos, Marquis of
Chaplin, C.
Chaplin, T.
Chichester, A.
Clements, J. M.
Clive, E. B.
Clive, H.
Cocks, J.
Coke, T. W.
Constable, Sir T.A.C.
Cooke, Sir H. F.
Cooper, E. S.
Cradock, J. H.
Cripps, J.
Dottin, A. R.
Douro, Marquis of
Drake, T. T.
Drake, W. T.
Duff, A.
Dugdale, W. S.
Duncannon, Lord
Dundas, Sir R. L.
Dundas, J. C.
Dundas, H.
Durham, Sir P.
Ellis, A. F.
Estcourt, T. H. S. B.
Ewing, J.
Fane, H. S.
Fane, J. T.
Fane, J.
Fergusson, Sir R. C.
Fitzgerald, W. F. V.
Fitzgerald, J.
Foley, J. H. H.
Forbes, J.
Forbes, Viscount
Forester, G. C. W.
French, A.
Freshfield, J. W.
Garlies, Viscount,
Gascoyne, J.
Gilbert, D.
Gordon, Sir J. W.
Gordon, J.
Greene, T.
Gregson, J.
Greville, Sir C. J.
Grimston, Viscount
Grosvenor, R.
Gurney, H.
Handcock, R.
Hawkins, J. H.
Heathcote, Sir G.
Hill, Lord G.
Holmesdale, Viscount
Hotham, Lord
Howard, F. G.
Hughes, W. L.
Hulse, Sir C.
Ingestrie, Viscount
Inglis, Sir R. H.
Jenkins, R.
Jermyn, Earl of
Jolliffe, Sir W. G. H.
Jolliffe, G. E.
Jones, T.
Kavanagh, T.
Kemp, T. R.
Kennedy, Lord
King, Sir J. D.
Lascelles, H.
Lemon, Sir C.
Lennard, T. B.
Leslie, C. P.
Lloyd, Sir E. P.
Loch, J.
Loughborough, Lord
Louvaine, Lord
Lowther, Sir J.
Lowther, H. C.
Lowther, J. H.
Luttrell, J. F.
Lygon, H. B.
Maberly, J.
Mahon, Viscount
Mahon, J. P. O. G.
Manners, Lord R.
Maule, W. R.
Meynell, H.
Mildmay, P. St. J.
Miles, P. J.
Miles, W.
Milton, Viscount
Montgomery, Sir J.
Moore, G.
Morgan, C. M. R.
Morgan, Sir C.
Mostyn, Sir T.
Mountcharles, Earl
Newport, Sir J.
Neeld, J.
Noel, Sir G. N.
North, J. H.
O'Neill, J. B. R.
Ogle, Sir C.
O'Grady, S.
Ossory, Earl of
Owen, Sir J.
Owen, H. O.
Oxmantown, Lord
Peach, N. W.
Pennefather, M.
Pelham, J. C.
Penruddocke, J. H.
Phillips, Sir R. B. P.
Pigott, G. G. W.
Pitt, J.
Polhill, F.
Ponsonby, W. F. S.
Prittle, F. A.
Ramsden, J. C.
Roberts, W. A.
Ross, C.
Rose, G. P.
Russell, W.
Russell, R. G.
Russell, J.
Saunderson, A.
Shaw, F.
Slaney, R. A.
Smith, T. A.
Smith, G.
Smith, R.
Somerville, Sir M.
Spence, G.
Stewart, Sir H.
St. Paul, Sir H. D. C.
Surrey, Earl of
Sutton, C. M.
Talbot, C. R. M.
Tavistock, Marquis of
Tennant, C.
Thompson, G. L.
Thomson, P. B.
Thynne, Lord H. F.
Townshend, Lord J.N.
Traill, G.
Tunno, E. R.
Twiss, H.
Thynne, Lord J.
Tynte, C. K. K.
Uxbridge, Earl of
Vaughan, Sir R. W.
Vaughan, J. E.
Vere, J. J. H.
Villiers, T. H.
Walrond, B.
Walsh, Sir J. B.
Ward, W.
Wemyss, J.
Wetherell, Sir C.
Whitbread, W. H.
Whitmore, T.
Wigram, W.
Williams, J.
Williams, T. P.
Williams, Sir R.
Williams, R.
Wilson, Sir R. T.
Worcester, Marquis of
Wood, M.
Wyndham, W.
Wynn, C. W. G.
Wynn, J.
Yorke, Sir J. S.

COUNTY MEMBERS—ENGLISH

FOR THE MOTION.

Acland, Sir T. D.
Adeane, H. J.
Althorp, Lord
Astley, Sir J. D.
Bankes, H.
Benett, J.
Bethell, R.
Briscoe, J. I.
Brougham, H.
Bunbury, Sir H. E.
Burrell, W.
Byng, G.
Calvert, N.
Curteis, H. B.
Denison, W. J.
Duncombe, Hon. W.
Dundas, C.
Ebrington, Visct.
Foley, T. H.
Foulkes, Sir W.
Graham, Sir J. R.
Guise, Sir W. B.
Heathcote, Sir W.
Hodges, T. L.
Hume, J.
Ingilby, Sir W.
Keck, G. A.
Knatchbull, Sir E.
Lawley, F.
Littleton, E. J.
Lumley, J. F.
Mandeville, Visct.
Morpeth, Lord
Osborne, Lord F. G.
Palmer, R.
Patten, J. W.
Pendarvis, E. W.
Portman, E. B.
Price, Sir R.
Sandford, E. A.
Sebright, Sir J. T.
Stanley, Lord
Tyrell, J. T.
Tyrell, C.
Vyvyan, Sir R. R.
Western, C. C.
Wrottesley, Sir J.

AGAINST THE MOTION.

Bell, M.
Cartwright, W. R.
Cotterell, Sir J. G.
Dugdale, G. S.
Egerton, W.
Fleming, J.
Hill, Sir R.
Lowther, Viscount
Munday, F.
Norreys, Lord
Powlett, Lord W.
Somerset, Lord G.
Somerset, Lord R.
Sotheron, F.
Strathaven, Lord

ABSENT.

Beaumont, T. W.
Belgrave, Visct.
Cavendish, Lord G.
Chandos, Marquis of
Chaplin, C.
Coke, T. W.
Dickinson, W.
Fane, J.
Heathcote, Sir G.
Lowther, Sir J.
Lowther, H. C.
Lygon, H. B.
Manners, Lord R.
Morgan, Sir C.
Noel, Sir G.
Pelham, J. C.
Russell, W.
Smith, Hon. R.
Stewart, W.
Tavistock, Marquis of

COUNTY MEMBERS—IRISH

FOR THE MOTION.

Acheson, Lord
Bateson, Sir R.
Blaney, C. D.
Brabazon, Lord
Browne, Hon. W.
Browne, J.
Brownlow, C.
Burke, Sir J.
Chapman, M. L.
Dawson, A.
Fitzgerald, Lord W.
Fitzgibbon, Hon. R.
Grattan, J.
Howard, H.
Killeen, Lord
King, Hon. H.
Lambert, J. S.
Lefroy, A.
M'Namara, W. N.
Maxwell, H.
O'Connell, D.
O'Connor, Don.
O'Farrall, R. M.
Parnell, Sir H.
Rochfort, G.
White, Col.
White, Samuel
Wyse, T. jun.
Valentia, Visct.

AGAINST THE MOTION.

Castlereagh, Visct.
Chichester, Sir A.
Coote, Sir C.
Corry, H. L.
Corry, Visct.
Fitzgerald, M.
Hart, G. V.
Hill, Lord A.
King, R.
M'Clintock, J.
Shirley, E. J.

ABSENT.

Archdall, M.
Belfast, Earl of
Beresford, Lord G.
Bernard, T.
Boyle, Lord
Browne, D.
Bruen, H.
Clements, J. M.
Cooper, E. S.
Duncannon, Lord
Forbes, Visct.
French, A.
Jones, F.
Kavanagh, T.
Mahon, O'Gorman
Mountcharles, Earl
O'Grady, Col.
O'Neil, Hon. J. B.
Ossory, Earl of
Oxmanstown, Lord
Prittie, Hon. F. A.
Sanderson, Alex.
Somerville, Sir M.
Stewart, Sir H.

CLERK OF THE COUNCIL.] Mr. *Stanley*, referring to a question which he had before put to the right hon. Secretary for the Home Department, as to whether the situation of Clerk of the Council had been filled up, said that the right hon. Gentleman had declared that he knew nothing on the subject. He would now repeat the question, because he understood that the situation had been filled up, though he thought it was one which ought not to be continued, by the Lord President having appointed his own son to the office.

Sir *R. Peel* could assure the hon. Member in sincerity, that till he came down to the House to-day, he knew nothing on the subject.

Mr. *Stanley* said, he understood the situation was filled up within twenty-four hours after the vacancy.

Sir *R. Peel* said, he knew not through what office the appointment was made; but it was not through that of the Secretary for the Home Department.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, Nov. 16.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By the Earl of HARDWICKE, from Lynn, for a repeal of the Duty on Coals borne Coastways. By the Duke of RICHMOND, from Tenterden and Goudhurst, for a Reduction of Taxes, and Reform in Parliament. For the abolition of Negro Slavery, from several parts of the country, by Earl SPENCER, the Duke of NORFOLK, the Earl of ESSEX, Lords WHARNCLIFFE, SUFFIELD, and CALTHORPE, the Earl of MELROS, Lord DACRE, the Duke of RICHMOND, the

STATEMENT of the VOTES of the FOURTEEN REPRESENTATIVES of the County of Surrey, on the Motion for a Select Committee on the Civil List, Nov. 15, 1830.

Place.	Name.	For.	Against.	Absent.
County	Dennison, W. J.	—		
	Briscoe, J. I.	—		
Bletchingly	Mills, R. W.	—		
	Tennyson, C.	—		
Gatton	Hope, J. T.		—	
	Shelley, J. V.		—	
Guilford	Wall, C. B. B.	—		
	Sumner, Holme	—		
Haslemere	Beckett, Sir J.		—	
	Holmes, W.		—	
Ryegate	Cocks, James			—
	Yorke, Sir J.			—
Southwark	Wilson, Sir Robert			—
	Total ..	6	4	3

the Bishops of PETERBOROUGH and of BATH and WELLS, (1,671 in number) by the Duke of GLOUCESTER, and by Lord WYNFORD, from a place in Northumberland.

[His Lordship said, he trusted the principle of indemnity to the holders of West-Indian property would not be overlooked when discussing the question of the abolition of Slavery in the Colonies.]

RESIGNATION OF THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.] The Duke of *Wellington* said—"My Lords, I deem it my duty to inform your Lordships, that in consequence of what occurred last night in the other House of Parliament, I felt it right to wait this morning on the King, and tender his Majesty the resignation of the office which I hold; that his Majesty has been pleased to accept of my resignation,

STATEMENT of the VOTES of the FORTY-FIVE REPRESENTATIVES of SCOTLAND, on the 15th of November, 1830, on the Motion for the appointment of a Select Committee to take into consideration the Accounts relating to the Civil List, presented to the House by command of his Majesty.

Places.	For Ministers.	Against Ministers.	Absent.
Aberdeenshire	Hon. Wm. Gordon		
Argyleshire	.. ..	.. ..	W. F. Campbell
Ayrshire	William Blair		
Banffshire	John Morrison		
Berwickshire	Hon. Capt. A. Maitland		
Buteshire &c.	Right Hon. Sir W. Rae		
Clackmannanshire, &c.	.. ..	.. ..	Hn. G. R. Abercromby
Dumbartonshire	Lord M. W. Graham		
Dumfries-shire	J. J. Hope Johnston		
Edinburghshire	Sir George Clerk		
Elgin and Morayshires	F. W. Grant		
Fifeshire	.. ..	.. ..	Captain James Wemyss
Forfarshire	.. ..	.. ..	Hon. Wm. Maule
Haddingtonshire	Lord John Hay		
Inverness-shire	.. ..	Rt. Hon. Chas. Grant	
Kinkardineshire	Hon. H. Arbuthnot		
Kickcudbrightshire	.. ..	R. C. Ferguson	
Lanarkshire	Hon. Charles Douglas		
Linlithgowshire	Hon. Sir A. Hope		
Nairnshire	.. ..	Hn. Cpt. G. P. Campbell	
Orkneyshire	.. ..	.. ..	G. Trail
Peebles-shire	.. ..	.. ..	Sir J. Montgomery
Perthshire	Sir G. Murray, G. C. B.		
Renfrewshire	.. ..	Sir Michl. Shaw Stewart	
Ross-shire	Sir J. W. Mackenzie		
Roxburghshire	Henry F. Scott		
Stirlingshire	H. H. Drummond		
Sutherlandshire	Lord F. L. Gower		
Selkirkshire	A. Pringle		
Wigtonshire	Sir Andrew Agnew		
ROYAL BURGHS.			
Aberdeen, &c.	Sir Jas. Carnegie		
Anstruther, &c.	J. Balfour		
Ayr, Irvine, &c.	.. ..	T. F. Kennedy	
Dumfries, &c.	.. ..	W. R. K. Douglas	
Dysart, &c.	.. ..	.. ..	Lord Loughborough
Edinburgh	Rt. Hon. W. Dundas		
Elgin, &c.	.. ..	.. ..	Hon. Gen. A. Duff
Glasgow, &c.	A. Campbell		
Inverness, &c.	John Baillie		
Jedburgh, &c.	Colonel A. Dalrymple		
Linlithgow, &c.	Henry Monteith		
Perth, &c.	Hon. S. Wortley		
Stirling, &c.	.. ..	James Johnston	
Tain, &c.	James Loch		
Wigton, &c.	.. ..	.. ..	J. H. Lowther
Total	29	7	9

Of the forty-five Members from Scotland, twenty-nine voted with Ministers, against a Committee to inquire into the Civil List, and seven voted for the Committee; and of the nine absent Members, we believe only three would have voted for the Committee, and six against it—making the number of Scots Representatives thirty-five who support Ministers, *i. e.* nearly 6-7ths of the whole number.

and that I continue in my present situation only till a successor shall have been appointed." The noble Duke immediately left the House.

CLERK OF THE COUNCIL.] Earl *Grosvenor* wished to know from the noble Earl opposite, whether it was true that he had bestowed the appointment of Clerk to the Privy Council, vacant by the sudden death of Mr. Buller, on any individual. If rightly informed, though he was unwilling to believe the report, the vacancy had been filled up by the noble Earl within twenty-four hours of its occurrence—a haste, he thought, not becoming with a patent office of so much emolument.

Earl *Bathurst* said, that no appointment had taken place.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, Nov. 16.

MINUTES.] Account ordered. On the Motion of Mr. W. WHITMORE, the Grain and Flour imported from abroad, and from Ireland, in each of the last ten years.

Petitions presented. For a repeal of the Duty on Coals, by Sir R. GRESLEY, from 500 inhabitants of Sunderland:—By Lord W. POWLETT, from the Merchants of Sunderland:—By Sir T. ACLAND, from South Molton. For the abolition of Negro Slavery, by Mr. TRAIL, from Thurso:—By Lord STRATHAVEN, from Fenny Stanton:—By Mr. WHITBREAD, from Bedford:—By Mr. LEFROY, from Kilmacross, and five other places in Ireland:—By Lord F. OSBORNE, two from Cambridgeshire:—By Mr. DALRYMPLE, from Haddington:—By Lord ALTHORP, from a Parish in Northamptonshire:—By Sir J. M'DONALD, from Calne:—By Sir F. BLAKE, from Berwick-on-Tweed and Bishop Wearmouth:—By Sir W. FOLKES, from Cressingham, in Norfolk:—By Mr. TYRELL, three from Essex:—By Sir T. ACLAND, three from Devonshire:—By Mr. DENMAN, two from Nottingham:—By Lord G. CAVENDISH, several from Derby:—By Mr. W. WHITMORE, from Oswestry:—By Mr. JONES, from Dissenters at Narberth:—By Mr. FANE, from Chipping-Norton. For the improvement of Education in Ireland, by Lord ALTHORP, from Kilcoman and Robin, in the County of Mayo. For Parliamentary Reform, by the Marquis of BLANDFORD, from Horsham:—By Mr. O'CONNELL, from the Association for Radical Reform, meeting at the Rotunda, in Blackfriars-road:—By Lord FORDWICH, from Canterbury:—By Lord NUGENT, from High Wycomb. For a Repeal of the Union, by Mr. WYSE, from Carrick-on-Suir.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.] Mr. *Warburton*, in presenting a Petition from Bridport, praying for a Reform by ballot, for the enlargement of the right of suffrage, and for the exclusion of all placemen from the House, said, that in the latter part of the prayer he could not at all concur. He thought it necessary that some of the members of the Administration should be in the House, to propose and defend the measures of Government.

Mr. *Hume* said, that he was sorry to differ from his hon. friend, with whom he had so often the happiness to agree. He thought, however, that the House would be much better constituted if no placeman had a seat in it, and if Ministers, when present, were only allowed to explain their measures, and not to vote upon them. Among the changes which he expected would shortly take place, one most advisable change, in his opinion, would be the fixing of some limit to the number of persons holding seats in that House, who were dependent on the Crown, or holding naval and military commissions under it. The number of such Members, he believed, was at present nearly equal to a third part of the House, and was a great, enormous, and crying evil. He believed that all naval and military officers considered themselves independent, but when they looked forward to promotion, he was afraid that a change sometimes came over their views of public questions, almost unknown to themselves. He was therefore of opinion that the House would never fairly represent the opinions of the people until all naval, military, and civil officers were prohibited from holding seats in that House. He said, that not an East-India Director,—no, nor a Bank Director either,—no, nor any one holding a monopoly under the Crown, the King's Printer included among the rest,—should be allowed to have a seat in the House. That was his view of things, and be believed that the people went along with him in it. He did not expect to see such a reform carried all at once; but the thing must come gradually down, and he should be happy to see the day when no Minister should have a place in that House, except for the sake of explaining his measures.

The Sheriffs of London presented at the bar two Petitions from the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council of the City of London, one relative to the rates for London Bridge, and the other calling for Parliamentary Reform. The first was referred to the Bridge Committee.

On moving that the latter be read,

Mr. Alderman *Wood* availed himself of the opportunity to state the reasons why the Corporation of London had again come forward to petition for Parliamentary Reform. The members of the Common Council, being elected annually, might fairly be considered as representatives of the feelings of the thousands by whom they were elected. They knew that their constituents were as favourable to reform at the present moment as they had ever been in past times; but they likewise knew, that it would be impossible to collect them together, and to gain a declaration of their sentiments in the Common Hall, in the short time allowed them by the notice which the hon. and learned member for Yorkshire had given of his motion on this subject. If that great body had assembled, he had no doubt but that ninety-nine out of every hundred persons who constituted it would have signed a similar petition to the present. The leading members of the Corporation had, therefore, assembled the Common Council, and their reason for so doing was the declaration recently made by the Duke of Wellington,—that the country required no change in its representative system. It was impossible that they should sit silent after such a declaration, because they knew that their constituents were suffering severely in consequence of the want of reform; for till reform was granted, they did not expect that any of those reductions of expenditure would be made to which they felt themselves entitled. He hoped that by the decision of that night his constituents would be satisfied that reform was at hand. Indeed, it was impossible that it should be otherwise, after the division of last night,—a division at which he was sorry that severe indisposition prevented him from being present. The declaration in the King's Speech, followed up by the postponement of the King's visit to the City, led him to think that it was time for the Government to be changed. He wished to say that he had no words to express his astonishment at the impropriety of which the Lord Mayor and Sir Claudius Hunter had been guilty, in making communications to the Government without any authority from their brother Magistrates. He must blame Ministers for being frightened by two such persons, when he believed—indeed, he was sure—that they might have gone to the City,—he would have done all in his power to preserve them from danger,—and they might have been as safe in their seats at Guildhall as in that House or any where else.

On the question being put, that the Petition be read,

RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS.] Sir *Robert Peel* rose and spoke as follows:—

"Sir,—The deep and unfeigned respect which I owe to this House induces me to take the earliest possible opportunity of publicly stating, here in my place, that, in consequence of what occurred last night, I have felt it my duty to wait upon the King, and humbly and respectfully to inform his Majesty, that I perceive it is no longer in my power to undertake the administration of public affairs, so far as the administration of those affairs depends upon me, either with satisfaction to my own feelings, or with perfect advantage to the country. Sir, his Majesty has been graciously pleased to accept the resignation thus tendered on my part, and I have to inform the House, therefore, that I consider myself as holding the Seals of the Home Department only until his Majesty shall have been enabled to appoint a successor to me in the office which I have resigned. The same, Sir, is the case with the other members of the Government. They all consider themselves as holding their respective offices only until their successors shall be appointed."

Lord *Althorp* said, in consequence of the communication which we have just received from the right hon. Baronet, I am sure that every Gentleman will feel that it would be most improper and most incorrect to undertake any serious and important debate under such circumstances. There is no longer any Administration in existence, and I hope that my hon. and learned friend (Mr. Brougham) will not submit to the House this evening a question of so much importance as that of which he has given notice. In my memory, no important question has ever been discussed under such circumstances; and I trust, therefore, that for this reason, as well as for the advantage of the question, my hon. friend will comply with the suggestion I now make to him.

Mr. *Brougham* said, I am sure that the respect which I feel for this House is, on all occasions, fully equal to that which has been so fitly and so gracefully expressed by the right hon. Secretary. I do, however, feel the greatest repugnance to putting off the motion which stands for this evening. My noble friend (Lord Althorp) near me is quite right in saying that no question of so much importance has ever before been brought forward when there was a deficiency in the effective government; but my difficulty is this--namely, that no question of so much importance — no question involving such mighty and extensive interests—has ever yet been discussed at all, under any circumstances, within the walls of this House. Sensible, therefore, of the deep responsibility which I have incurred in undertaking to bring forward a question of such vast importance, I cannot help feeling the difficulty in which I am placed, in being called on by my noble friend to defer it,—especially as the suggestion of my noble friend has been backed in some degree by the expression of similar opinions on the part of others. I am anxious, of course, both from the respect I owe to the House, and out of regard to the interests of the question itself, to defer to the declared sense of the House, both as to the shape in which I shall bring forward the motion, and as to the manner in which I shall bring it forward, as well as in respect to the time at which I shall bring it forward. I throw myself, therefore, fully, freely, and respectfully upon the House. If the motion be put off, I own it will be contrary to my opinion, and to my wishes; the House may be right or it may be wrong; I may be right, or I may be wrong; but I think that I am right, and I beg it, therefore, to be understood, that what I do, I do in deference to the wishes of the House. And further, as no change that may take place in the Administration can by any possibility affect me, I beg it to be understood that, in putting off the motion, I will put it off until the 25th of this month and no longer. I will then, and at no more distant period, bring forward the question of parliamentary Reform, whatever may be the condition of circumstances, and whosoever may be his Majesty's Ministers.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, I feel it necessary, in order to guard against misunderstanding, to trespass again for a few moments upon the attention of the House. I am not apprehensive of anything I have said being misunderstood here: but in order to guard against any misapprehension going forth to the country, I may be allowed to notice one expression which fell from the noble Lord (Althorp) opposite. I know very well what the noble Lord meant, but out of doors the expression to which I allude may possibly be misconstrued. The noble Lord said, "There is no longer any Administration in existence." This is, no doubt, in effect true; but it ought to be generally known and understood, that until my successor is appointed, I am in full possession of the authority of the Secretary of State for the Home Department; and that I am quite prepared, if public necessity should require me, to exercise that authority to its utmost extent, being quite confident that I shall receive the support of this House and of the country if I exert that authority in any case in which the public welfare calls for the exertion of it.

Lord *Althorp* said, I assure the right hon. Secretary that I did not misunderstand him. God forbid that I should have imputed to him any disposition to allow the public service to suffer injury in consequence of the changes which are about to take place. All I meant was, that under such circumstances, motions of so much importance as that of my hon. and learned friend, have never been discussed in Parliament.

Sir *R. Peel* said, my explanation was intended to prevent misconception out of doors. I was well aware that the noble Lord had not misunderstood me.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* rose amidst loud murmurs, and so much noise, that for some time he was totally inaudible in the gallery. When the hon. Member's voice could be heard, he observed that the Petition from the City of London had met with more complete concurrence than any other petition he recollected.

The Petition read, and ordered to be printed.

PETERSFIELD ELECTION.] Sir *James Macdonald* presented a Petition from Lord Porchester and Mr. Ogle, and also from several voters for Petersfield, complaining of the return of Sir William Jolliffe, and his brother, Mr. Gilbert Jolliffe. The Petition stated, that the returning officer is nominated by the Leet Jury, a body carefully selected by the steward of the Court, from the friends and dependants of the Lord of the Manor, Mr. Jolliffe; that the returning officer at the last election was a tenant of Mr. Jolliffe's, and his assessor an attorney from Croydon, in Surrey, who acted as Mayor in 1826, at the request of Mr. Jolliffe; that by the partial, illegal, and arbitrary conduct of the Mayor and his Assessor, Lord Porchester and Mr. Ogle were deprived of the votes of many *bona fide* electors upon the most frivolous objections—such as that they were not in possession of their title-deeds, although they offered attested copies, and proved that Mr. Jolliffe held the original deeds as the owner of the largest part of the property held under the same title, and although they had *bona fide* paid the purchase-money, and been in possession and received the rents for several years; that the Mayor admitted many persons to vote in Messrs. Jolliffe's interest, who were not *bona fide* freeholders, and particularly that, although it was admitted by the Mayor that persons had polled at former elections for Mr. Jolliffe, who held only faggot votes, and although the vote of Samuel Twyford, Esq., who had voted at former elections, was rejected, because it was evident, from the manner in which he answered the questions of the opposing counsel, that he had never paid any consideration for his freehold, and was possessed of no real interest in it, but had merely accepted a fraudulent and collusive conveyance from Mr. Jolliffe to qualify him to vote in his interest, the Mayor afterwards, in defiance of reason and justice, admitted persons to vote for the Jolliffe candidates who refused to answer the same questions that had been put to Mr. Twyford, merely because they had voted at former elections. The Petitioners also charge the Members with having procured their election by bribery and treating.

Petition ordered to be taken into consideration January 4th.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, Nov. 17.

MINUTES.] Petitions from several places in York, Durham, Staffordshire, and other places, were presented by Lords WHARNCLIFFE, SUFFIELD, DURHAM, KING, the Earl of HADDINGTON, and the Bishop of LICHFIELD, for the abolition of Negro Slavery.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, Nov. 17.

MINUTES.] New Writs. Mr. C. GRANT moved that a New Writ be issued for Liverpool, in consequence of the death of the Right Hon. W. Huskisson, since his election:—Sir R. WILSON moved that a New Writ be issued for Southwark, in consequence of the death of Mr. Harris since his election:—Lord EBRINGTON being called upon to make his election between the County of Devon and the Borough of Tavistock, for both of which he had been elected, informed the Speaker that he made his election to serve for the County of Devon. A New Writ was accordingly ordered to be issued for Tavistock:—Lord Milton having accepted the Chiltern Hundreds, a New Writ was issued for the Borough of Peterborough, on the Motion of Sir R. HERON.

Petitions presented. For the abolition of Negro Slavery, by Sir G. NUGENT, from Buckingham:—By Mr. WESTERN, three from Towns in Essex:—By Sir C. MORGAN, from Brecon:—By Mr. BURTON, two from Beverley and the vicinity; and one by Mr. D. SYKES:—By Mr. CHOLMONDELEY, from Spalding:—By Mr. CARTWRIGHT, from a Parish in Bedfordshire, and from another in Northamptonshire:—By Mr. WYNDHAM, from Salisbury:—By Mr. M. A. TAYLOR, two from South Shields and the vicinity:—By Lord EBRINGTON, from Ilfracombe and Topsham:—By Mr. DUNCOMBE, five from Yorkshire:—By Sir G. HEATHCOTE, from Rutlandshire:—By Lord MORPETH, a great number from the vicinity of Doncaster:—By Mr. WILKS, from Plymouth and Deptford:—By Sir J. GRAHAM, four from Cumberland, seven from Northumberland, and one from Westmoreland:—By Mr. BELL, two from Northumberland:—By Mr. LOWTHER, from Shafton, and three other places:—By Sir W. GUISE, five from Gloucestershire:—By Mr. S. JERNINGHAM, from Pontefract:—By Mr. LANGSTON, from Oxford:—By Mr. J. SMITH, three from Bognor:—By Lord TAVISTOCK, from Dunstable, and three other places:—By Sir T. ACLAND, from Devonport:—By Mr. DENISON, from Camberwell:—By Lord W. POWLETT, from South Shields:—By Mr. MARSHALL, from Leominster:—By Mr. J. WOOD, from a place near Wigan, Lancashire.

[Mr. *D. Sykes*, in presenting his petition, took occasion to observe, that he would not give his support to any government which would not pledge itself to give freedom to the slave, an improved system of representation to the people, and a great reduction of taxation to all classes of the community.]

Against the Duty on Sea-borne Coal, by Sir J. GRAHAM, from Sunderland:—By Sir W. GORDON, from Padstow:—By Lord EBRINGTON, from Topsham and Ashburton. Praying for a remission of the House and Window Tax, by Mr. H. DAVIS, from a Ward in Bristol. For a revision of the Bankrupt Laws, by Mr. O'CONNELL, from an individual who had been in business at Limerick, and had unfortunately become Bankrupt.

A Bill was brought in by Mr. PORTMAN, to Consolidate and Amend the Laws relating to Highways in England and Wales.

POSTPONEMENT OF ELECTION COMMITTEES.] Sir *M. W. Ridley* said, it would not be necessary that he should detain the House many minutes with the reasons that had induced him to give notice of the Motion that stood on the paper. Late occurrences had, however, furnished him with a new argument in favour of the Resolution he should submit to the House. In consequence of the resignation of the late Ministry, a considerable time must elaspse before the Members who were to compose the new Administration could take their seats in the House. This would cause delay, and hon. Members generally looked forward to a long recess. It would be impossible for the House to proceed with any effective business in the absence of Ministers, and he did not see why Members should be kept in town for the mere purpose of attending election committees. There were many election petitions which would not be heard at all; but the hearing of some was fixed for an early day, and these he did not mean to include in his Resolution, which was, "That the House will not, before the adjournment of the House for the Christmas recess, take into consideration any election petitions except those which are fixed for the 25th and 30th days of this instant November." He left this Resolution in the hands of the House, observing only, that he had no interest, direct or indirect, in any of the petitions that had been presented on this subject.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* thought, the Gentlemen who expected a very long recess at Christmas would find themselves mistaken. Up to that recess, whatever it might be, the House must sit constantly, and he could not anticipate any long recess when he saw the state in which the money votes stood. If the House did sit, what more important business could be brought before it than these petitions? He thought that, if this Resolution were passed, much inconvenience would result to the House, and he was sure it would be a great hardship upon those concerned in the fate of the petitions. There were, in all, sixty-eight petitions, and it was pretty certain that, although they would not all be heard, there would be at least fifty-five ballots. It appeared to him, that to agree to this Resolution, would be to delay justice in cases which required the most speedy adjudication that the House could make.

Mr. *Brougham* was decidedly opposed to this Motion. He thought it a matter of the utmost necessity that they should fill up their numbers; and entertaining such an opinion, he could not but be astonished, both at the proposition itself, and still more at the reasons given in its favour. "What," said the hon. and learned Gentleman, "do we want with the presence of the Ministers on election petitions? What do we want with them? We can do as well (I speak it with all possible respect of any future Ministry); but I say we can do as well without them as with them. I have nothing to do with them except in the respect I bear them, and except as a Member of this House. I state this for the information of those who may feel any interest in the matter." The Motion of his hon. friend involved a matter relating to one of the most important questions that could occupy the attention of that House. It was a question who had and who had not a right to sit there; and to delay determining such a question might possibly be, in fact, allowing men to sit there who had no right to the seats they occupied, and excluding other men who had the best right to them. He could not, therefore, consent to the postponement of such a question. As to the inconvenience it was supposed Members would feel from remaining in town, he begged to observe, that till within these two days Members had every reason to expect that they would be obliged to remain in town till a few days before Christmas; and the event which had happened within these two days was the first that could have led them to expect an adjournment of the House. It was impossible, therefore, that they could feel much inconvenience at not being able to enjoy a temporary leisure, which, till within so short a period, they had no reason to expect. If the Motion were carried, the inconvenience to parties would be very great, for in many instances they had their witnesses in town, and their briefs prepared and delivered. He knew not what motive of interest, either in or out of that House, could be served by such a delay; but of this he was sure, that the delay, without being called for by circumstances, or even justified by necessity, would be found to be very injurious to many parties. The petitioners and their opponents were both entitled to have their interests advocated by the best Counsel whom they could select from the Common Law Bar, the Members of which were most generally selected for arguing these questions: but if the consideration of the petitions was delayed till February that selection could not be had, and the monopoly which now existed would be preserved. On all these grounds he felt so strongly opposed to the Motion, that he should take the sense of the House upon it; and he trusted that he should find they would not so far forget their duty to themselves as to grant the proposed delay.

Sir *E. Carrington* concurred in the view taken by the hon. and learned Member, and he meant to oppose the Motion.

Mr. *Littleton* was also decidedly opposed to the Resolution. There could be no necessity for the presence of Ministers, since, by virtue of their office, they were allowed, by Act of Parliament, to absent themselves on such occasions.

Mr. *Portman* was of opinion that all persons connected with election petitions should precisely understand the time when the committees upon such petitions were to be ballotted for. If that were known he thought it was of no importance how the Motion was decided.

Mr. *Cresset Pelham* was opposed to delay.

Sir *M. W. Ridley*, in reply, disclaimed having any private or personal motives for bringing forward this Motion. He had merely discharged what he considered to be his duty to the House.

DR. PHILLPOTTS, BISHOP OF EXETER.] Sir *J. Graham* said, before the House decided the question, he wished to take that opportunity to put a question to the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Peel) relative to a motion of his (Sir J. Graham's), the notice for which stood in the Order-book of the House for to-morrow evening. He had observed by the *Gazette* of last night, that the *congé d'elire* had passed the Great Seal, empowering the Dean and Chapter of Exeter to proceed to the election of Dr. Phillpotts as Bishop of that See. Now he (Sir J. Graham) was desirous to know whether his Majesty's Ministers, who were at present holding office only *pro tempore*, would advise his Majesty to issue the patent for enabling Dr. Phillpotts to hold the living of Stanhope *in commendam*, with the Bishopric of Exeter, if that living should become vacant before his Majesty's Ministers had their places supplied.

Sir *R. Peel* said, that his Majesty's pleasure had been taken respecting the issuing of the *congé d'elire* for the election of Dr. Phillpotts, before his Majesty's Government had been dissolved, and before the notice to which the hon. Baronet had referred had been given, and his Majesty's intentions had been notified, previous to the giving of that notice, to Dr. Phillpotts, respecting the living of Stanhope *in commendam;* the instruments for the *congé d'elire* had been accordingly completed; but no steps had been taken respecting the granting of the living of Stanhope *in commendam*, and no steps would be taken, until the consecration of Dr. Phillpotts had taken place. He should not feel himself justified in expediting the passing of any such instrument. He should not feel himself warranted in departing from the usual course, and therefore, until the consecration had taken place, he should not take any steps for the issuing of an instrument for the holding of the living in question *in commendam*. Probably his Majesty's Government would be completed before that time, and he should not have the opportunity of taking any such step respecting such an instrument. At the same time, he would say, that with regard to any instrument upon which his Majesty's pleasure had been taken previous to the dissolution of the Ministry, he should feel it his duty, as Secretary of State, though holding the Seals of office only *pro tempore*, to transmit to his Majesty such an instrument for his Majesty's signature. At the present moment, there were various instruments passing through the Home Office, respecting which his Majesty's pleasure had been already taken. This, however, he would state, for the satisfaction of the hon. Baronet, that he might be assured that nothing would be done secretly respecting this; but that, in the event, which was very improbable, of his (Sir Robert Peel's) holding the Seals of office when that instrument was to be made out, he should give him previous notice, and the fullest information which was necessary to enable him to bring that matter under the notice of the House. It was extremely improbable, as he had already said, that he should still hold the Seals of office then. He could not promise that, in such an event, he would depart from the usual course; but he repeated, that he would give the hon. Baronet notice before any step should be taken for making out the instrument. He was aware that any delay in the discussion of the hon. Baronet's motion would be most disagreeable to the Bishop of Exeter, after the notice which had been given by the hon. Baronet. After that notice it would be most disagreeable to him if his friends in that House should not have an opportunity, as soon as possible, of stating the reasons upon which he grounded his defence.

Sir *James Graham* observed, that the assurance just given by the right hon. Gentleman, if given in private, would be quite satisfactory and convincing, but such an assurance before that House was still more convincing, as a promise was now distinctly given that no artifice would be resorted to to prevent the sense of the House from being taken upon this question, if the consecration of the Bishop of Exeter should take place while the right hon. Gentleman held the Seals of the Home Department. He (Sir James Graham) did not wish that any departure should be made from the established usage until the consecration. He believed, however, that neither the issuing of the *congé d'elire*, nor the election, created the vacancy in the living, but that it was created by the consecration and the doing of homage. Consequently, until that had occurred, it would not be in the power of the right hon. Gentleman to take any steps to have the instrument in question made out. He should now postpone his motion, on the understanding that, if the right hon. Gentleman continued to hold the Seals of office when this living became vacant, he should have an opportunity of bringing the matter before the House. With regard to the wish which had been expressed on the part of Dr. Phillpotts, that this question should be raised at the earliest possible moment, he (Sir J. Graham) would only say, that he made no personal attack upon Dr. Phillpotts; that he had brought forward this question solely from a sense of his public duty; and that he should not depart from the course which, in accordance with that public duty, he had laid down for himself, merely for the purpose of gratifying the friends of Dr. Phillpotts. He therefore begged leave to postpone his Motion till to-morrow se'nnight.

Mr. *Phillpotts* expressed a hope, on behalf of his relative (Dr. Phillpotts) that the hon. Baronet would bring forward his Motion to-morrow, in order to afford Dr. Phillpotts the earliest opportunity for vindicating himself.

Sir *J. Graham* found it impossible to comply with the request.

The House divided upon the Motion of Sir M. W. Ridley, when the numbers were—For the Motion 91; Against it 156—Majority against it 65.

Other business was postponed.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, Nov. 18.

MINUTES.] The Earl of CRAVEN took the Oaths and his Seat.

Petitions presented. For the abolition of Slavery, by the Duke of GRAFTON, Earl TALBOT, Lord WHARNCLIFFE, Lord SUFFIELD, the Marquis of CLEVELAND, Lord DURHAM, the Marquis of BUTE, Lord BEXLEY, the Bishop of LICHFIELD and COVENTRY, the Earl of CARLISLE, the Earl of CHESTERFIELD, Earl ROSSLYN, Lord CALTHORPE, &c. The number of Petitions was very great. For the repeal of the Duty on Sea-borne Coals, by Lord CALTHORPE, from Ipswich.

AMENDMENT OF THE COMMON LAW.] Lord *Tenterden* moved the second reading of the Bills which he had had the honour on a recent evening to lay on their Lordships' Table. The object of those Bills was, to carry into effect some of the recommendations in the Report of the Commissioners who had been appointed to inquire into the means of improving the Administration of Justice in the Courts of Common Law. He did not, however, profess to comprehend in his measures all the recommendations of the Commissioners. Of the expediency and practicability of some of them he entertained considerable doubt. He was sure that he should meet with the entire concurrence of their Lordships, when he said that it was a subject which required the most deliberate consideration. The experience of his whole life had confirmed him in that opinion. He had accordingly bestowed all the consideration in his power upon the Bills on their Lordships' Table; and he had availed himself of the advice and suggestions of many learned friends. From his noble and learned friend on the Woolsack, and from several learned members of the committee, he had received essential assistance. He stated this in order to shew their Lordships that the propositions which he was submitting to them had not been hastily concocted. The Bills were five in number, and were entitled—The Judgment and Execution Bill, The Interpleader Bill, The Prohibition and Mandamus Bill, The Arbitration Bill, and The Witness Examination Bill. The noble and learned Lord moved the second reading of the first Bill, and explained that the object of it was, to procure speedy judgment in execution, leaving it to the discretion of the Judge to stay the judgment in execution if he thought fit.

Lord *Wynford* said, that he did not rise to oppose the second reading of his noble and learned friend's Bills. On the contrary, he thought that, as far as they went, they were calculated to do much good. Undoubtedly caution was necessary; but he had no hesitation in saying, that, in his opinion, much more might be done with a view to diminish the present expensive and dilatory character of the law.

Lord *Tenterden* admitted, that further improvements were necessary, but thought that they could not be made with too much caution.

Bill read a second time.

Lord *Tenterden* then severally moved the second reading of the other bills, explaining that the object of the Interpleader Bill was, to give a party, sued at law by two parties for that in which he had no interest, he being only a trustee, and having at present no relief but by a suit in equity—a means of obtaining relief at common law; that the object of the Prohibition and Mandamus Bill was, to improve the proceedings of the Courts, by abolishing the form of filing a suggestion of record; that the object of the Arbitration Bill was, to extend the power of the Judges as to the cases which they might refer to arbitration; and that the object of the Witnesses Bill was, to enable the Courts of law to order the examination of witnesses upon interrogatories: such a power they already possessed by a particular law as to India, and this Bill was to give them a similar power in various other cases.—All the Bills were severally read a second time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, Nov. 18.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. For the abolition of Negro Slavery, by Mr. MUNDAY, from Derbyshire:—By Mr. TYNTE, from Bridgewater:—By General KING, from Sligo:—By Mr. LITTLETON, ten from Staffordshire:—By Sir H. BUNBURY, from Ipswich and other places:—By Mr. EVANS, from Leicester:—By Mr. W. BROWN, from Killarney:—By Mr. TYRELL, ten from Essex:—By Mr. SCHONSWAR, from Hull:—By Mr. HODGSON, from Newcastle-upon-Tyne:—By Mr. STRUTT, from Swanwick:—By Mr. FOLEY, from Kidderminster:—By Mr. CURTEIS, from Brighton:—By Mr. PENDARVIS, from Cornwall:—By Mr. SYKES, from Rippon:—By Lord G. BENTINCK, from Lynn:—By Mr. C. WOOD, four from places in Yorkshire:—By Mr. BINGHAM, from Barnborough:—By the Marquis of CHANDOS, five from places in Hampshire:—By Lord STANLEY, from certain Dissenters of Southport, Macclesfield; and the Dissenters of Church-town:—By Lord G. CAVENDISH, from Dissenters at Derby:—By Sir T. ACLAND, from Modbury:—By Mr. J. MARTIN, from Tewkesbury. By Mr. LITTLETON, from the Staffordshire Potteries, praying that the Trade to China might be opened, and that the Distress of the lower orders might be relieved, by the abolition of Monopoly. By Mr. D. BROWN, from the Town of Galway, praying that Roman Catholics might be put on the same footing with Protestants:—By the Marquis of CHANDOS, a similar Petition. Against the Truck System, by Lord E. SOMERSET, from the Wool Manufacturers of Gloucester:—By Mr. ROBINSON, from the Retail Traders of Worcester. By Mr. O'CONNELL, from the Roman Catholics of a Parish in Mayo, praying that the Grants made for the Education of the Poor in Ireland should be distributed according to the original intention, so as to be made to apply for the benefit of the Roman Catholics as well as Protestants. By the same hon. Member, from a Parish in the Town of Galway, for the Repeal of the Union.

REFORM—DARTMOUTH.] Lord *Ebrington* presented a Petition from the Scot and Lot Payers of Dartmouth, complaining that all the inhabitants were not permitted to vote, though that right was given to them by a charter of Edward 3rd; but that the right was claimed exclusively by a Mayor, twelve Aldermen, and a limited number of freemen, making altogether fifty-one, of whom twenty-two only were resident. The petitioners prayed for Reform in the representation generally, as well as in their own particular case.

Mr. *Cresset Pelham* knew, that some of the allegations in the Petition were founded in fact; he regretted that the ancient constitution had been so departed from, and thought the time was come when the people would not be contented without some species of Reform.

Mr. *Holdsworth*, the sitting member for Dartmouth, suggested that the Petition should be withdrawn, as it had a tendency to prejudge his case. His return had been petitioned against, and he was now on the eve of a ballot.

Lord *Ebrington* said, he would withdraw it if the sense of the House was in favour of such a proceeding.

The *Speaker* said, the noble Lord must use his own discretion. There was no objection to the Petition, except as to the time of presenting it.

Lord Ebrington withdrew it for the present.

CHURCH OF IRELAND.] Mr. O'Connell presented a Petition from the Roman Catholic inhabitants of Galway, praying for equal rights.

Mr. *John Wood* observed, that the real object of those who petitioned for a repeal of the Legislative Union (which would be, in his opinion, a most mischievous measure) would be best served by bringing about a Reform in the Irish Church, and he recommended these persons to come forward manfully, and petition for that which they really wanted, and they would find many English Members to support them. He considered that the system of the Irish Church establishment required revision, both as regarded expense and non-residence, and that it was only in consequence of the Legislative Union that it had been maintained up to the present time. The non-resident clergy ought to forfeit their revenues, for they had no duty to perform, and no people to instruct.

Mr. *Goulburn* (the late Chancellor of the Exchequer) defended the Irish church, and stated, that it never was in a better state than at present. He denied that non-residence existed to such an extent as to be considered an evil, and he referred to the proof which had been afforded of this on the last occasion when the question was brought forward.

Colonel *O'Grady* supported the Petition, but bore witness to the exemplary conduct of the ministers of the Irish church. Within a few years that had been very much improved.

Mr. *Hume* denied the accuracy of the statement formerly made by Lord Plunkett that there were only twenty-five non-resident clergymen belonging to the Irish church, and gave notice that he would move to-morrow for a Return of all the Non-resident Clergy. He declared that the whole establishment required revision, and that whoever the Minister might be, he must grant it. It could be no longer borne, that clergymen, who had no parishioners should receive emoluments; or that such immense sums should be paid to churchmen. Whoever the new Minister might be, he must be subservient to the wishes of the people, and not attempt to rule them with a rod of iron. He wished to see the teachers of religion properly rewarded; but it was beyond human endurance, that they who pretended to teach the people the way to Heaven, should insist on taking from them all their worldly wealth.

Mr. *Ruthven* highly lauded the zeal, piety, learning, and character of the Irish clergy. They were most assiduous in doing their duty in that part of the country with which he was connected. At the same time he should like to see a more equal distribution of the property of the church among its members. Industrious Curates ought not to be allowed to starve, while Rectors were wallowing in wealth.

Mr. *D. Browne* observed, that the hon. Member who had just sat down mistook the purport of the observations of the hon. member for Middlesex, who had not attacked the character of the Irish clergy, but had merely stated, that he did not know what so many Protestant churchmen could do in that country. He must say, that he concurred with the spirit of that hon. Member's observation.

THE METROPOLITAN POLICE.] Sir *R. Wilson* said, that he had been desired to present a Petition from the Parish of St. John, Southwark, on the subject of the New Police. If the petitioners had passed any reflection upon that body, he certainly should have been at variance with them; for he must, in common justice, say that he had never seen a better conducted, or a more efficient body of men. The petitioners expressed an alarm in which he certainly did not concur. They thought this police force a dangerous one, and they were of opinion that it might be used, by an arbitrary Minister, to crush the liberties of the people. When he considered how very far superior in numbers the inhabitants of the metropolis only were to the police, he could not participate in such an apprehension. The petitioners, however, complained, as many others had complained, of the expense of the new police; and they said, that in consequence of the introduction of the police into their parish, they had incurred an additional charge for watching, to the amount of 700*l.* a-year. This was certainly a very large increase, and, as it appeared to him, a just ground of complaint.

Sir *R. Peel* said, that if he had remained in office, and if any one had proposed that a Select Committee should be appointed to inquire into the efficiency of the police, and whether the charge for it could be reduced, he should not have had the slightest difficulty in acceding to such a proposition. He should, on the contrary, be most ready to acquiesce in it; not because the expense of the police had in the slightest degree shaken his conviction that it was absolutely necessary that some such force should exist for the preservation of the persons and property of the inhabitants of this great metropolis, but because he should be glad to be afforded the public opportunity of examining into every proceeding connected with the new establishment, its mode of appointment, its arrangement, the real amount of the expense which was incurred for it, and of having a comparison drawn, both on the score of expense and efficiency, between the present improved system of police, and that which formerly existed. He should be glad to be afforded such an opportunity for the purpose of doing away with the gross misrepresentations which had been spread abroad by interested persons on this subject. If, therefore, any such committee should have been proposed, he, for one, should have been most happy, if he had continued in office, to second the motion, as he felt convinced that the result of the evidence which would be produced before that committee, would be, to establish in every respect the great claims which the new police possessed upon the public approbation and confidence. People supposed that the sole object of the new police establishment in London was to keep watch upon individual houses. Now no police, no matter how constituted, could do so effectually, if the individual inhabitants of such houses did not respectively exert themselves a little to protect their own property. It should be remembered, that within the last few months, in consequence of his Majesty's accession to the Throne, there had been various public occasions,—such as reviews, and other public exhibitions,—upon which immense crowds of people had been assembled, and in all such instances the most perfect order had been maintained by means of the new police. It was obvious at once that in a population such as existed in this metropolis of upwards of 1,200,000 persons, there should be some civil means for preserving order and regularity. If no such civil means existed, the only alternative would be the maintenance of an immense military force, and a corresponding increase in the army estimates and expenditure. If he had been rightly informed, the most perfect order and regularity had been maintained by the new police on the occasions to which he had alluded; and he had not heard, notwithstanding the immense number of persons that had been congregated on those occasions, that a single accident had occurred. He undoubtedly thought, that it might be made a question whether a portion of the charge for the police might not be fairly borne by the country at large. He believed that if the expense for the police had been limited to 6*d.* in the pound, they would not have heard a word about the unconstitutional nature of that force. He feared that it would be impossible to maintain the police establishment at a less charge than that now incurred for it, and if that charge was to continue to be defrayed by a local tax, it would be impossible to reduce it below 8*d.* in the pound. He must say, that when complaints were made of a charge of 2*s.* 6*d.* in the pound being imposed in consequence of the establishment of a local police, that such a charge was not countenanced by the law. The maximum charge was fixed by the Act at 8*d.* in the pound, and if the overseers of the different parishes asked the inhabitants to pay 2*s.* 6*d.* on account of the new police, he would tell them that the overseers had no legal authority to levy more than 8*d.* for that purpose. He knew that a great misunderstanding prevailed in the public on that subject, and he thought it right to say thus much with a view to remove it. He was afraid that the result of the labours of a committee, if the charge were still to be defrayed by local taxation, would not be to reduce its amount. He hoped that a committee, if one should be appointed, would enter minutely into every portion of the financial question with regard to this force,—that it would consider the amount of the wages,—the mode of forming the various corps, and that it would examine into the condition of every class of the police, and that it would consider whether it was possible to produce an efficient and respectable corps for less than the present charge. He did not think that such a force could be produced for a less charge, but if it could, and he had continued in office, no man would have been more ready to acquiesce in any suggestions from a committee to attain that object. The chief objection which had, in the first instance, been urged against the plan of the new police was, that the amount of salary was not such as would secure respectable persons to fill situations in it. A guinea a week was the salary, subject to certain deductions for lodgings, and other matters. One great object in the formation of the new police establishment was, that having removed it from the power of the local authorities, Parliament might always have an opportunity of exercising its power of inspection over it, and that from time to time, the various matters connected with it should come under the consideration of that House. He conceived, that the period had hardly arrived for the institution of such an inquiry, but, at the same time, if the excitement of the public mind was such as had been represented, let a committee be appointed, for he would maintain that, having taken away the local authority over the police, that House was bound to institute any inquiry which might be necessary on the subject. He would say, as Secretary of State, that if the police force was not honestly managed and conducted, it would be a curse, instead of being an advantage, to the public. He was, therefore, of opinion that a parliamentary committee should, from time to time, be appointed on the subject, not with a view to throw any doubts upon the general efficiency of the new police, but for the purpose of seeing whether improvements might not be made in the efficiency and arrangement of that force. With regard to the recommendations of the parishes, they had been always properly attended to: he had shown no favour in the appointment, and he was sure that every Gentleman in that House must know that he had not prostituted the appointments in the new police to any private purpose. The parishes should understand, that they could recommend individuals who were qualified for the situation, and that their recommendations would be attended to, as well as those from any other quarter. But if the parishes were to recommend those they thought fit, and if there was to be no difficulty whatever in complying with their recommendation, the effect would be to give to the parishes a control over the appointment of the police, which it was the object of the Act to take out of their hands. The effect would be to do away with all the benefits resulting from the new police establishment, and to do away with the arrangement of the whole metropolitan police being placed under the control of one head, upon which arrangement the efficiency of the present public establishment so entirely depended. At the same time he thought that there should be always a ready disposition on the part of that head to act in concert and cooperate with the parish authorities.

Mr. *Wilks* had had repeated opportunities to notice the exertions of the police, and was bound to express his satisfaction at what he had witnessed. He concurred with the right hon. Gentleman in thinking that the additional expense was in a great degree the cause of the unpopularity of the new police. He was anxious that a committee should be appointed on the subject, and he was sure that the appointment of such a committee would be received with gratitude by the people.

Sir *R. Peel* gave notice, that immediately after the Christmas recess, he would move for the appointment of a Select Committee on the subject. He repeated, he would move for such a committee, not from any doubts which he entertained of the efficiency of the new police, but because he was anxious that the whole establishment should be examined.

Mr. *Hume* observed, that he had recently received deputations from three parishes, and they all concurred in substance with the statement just made by the right hon. Gentleman, as to the expediency of having a committee appointed on this subject. He thought that the unpopularity under which the new police now laboured, was founded on error. As to what had been said about the force being unconstitutional, he did not agree with the statement—it was not an unconstitutional force—nor was a standing army. The objection as to a force being unconstitutional depended not so much on the force itself as on the manner in which it was maintained, and on the nature of the control exercised over it. He repeated, therefore, that neither the police, nor even the standing army, was an unconstitutional force in itself; but it might be made so by the way in which it was treated by the Government. The great objection was to the expensiveness of the establishment, and in the increased amount of rates levied on the parishes. In the parish of Ealing, for instance, where the old watch only cost 80*l.* a-year, the inhabitants now paid 800*l.*, and one man alone in that parish, who had formerly only paid 1*s.* now paid 50*l.* [*No, no!*]. He was not quite sure of the sum, but he believed it to be near what he had mentioned. At least the increase was very great. It was the same in the parish of Hackney, and he believed it would be in the power of the committee to do away with many of the grievances.

Colonel *Sibthorp* entered his protest against saddling the country with any part of the expense of the Metropolitan Police. He thought that as the advantages of the police were local, the taxation should be so too.

Mr. *Byng* knew, that the great grievance of the establishment was its expensiveness, which he had reason to believe was not equally borne by the different parishes in which the police was now stationed. Some of the out-parishes especially were burthened far beyond those in the metropolis itself, and far beyond their means of payment. The country at large was interested in the preservation of peace in the metropolis, and ought to contribute to maintain the police.

Mr. *Maberly* thanked the right hon. Gentleman for the manner in which he had expressed himself on this subject, and observed, that in addition to the evil of expense, the establishment was defective on account of the want of concert between the head office and the local authorities. With respect to the expense, he did believe that some of the complaints had been fostered by local boards, who, in the establishment of the new police, had been deprived of their parish patronage. He hoped therefore the House would appoint a committee, and would thoroughly examine the subject.

Mr. *Wyse* objected to extending the expense of supporting the Metropolitan Police to the country at large. Each district should pay its own local expenses. It was in that manner that the constabulary force in Ireland was supported.

Sir *R. Peel* observed, that the hon. Member was mistaken, since the expense of the constabulary force in Ireland was not supported by local taxation alone. A considerable part of the expense of that establishment was taken from the Consolidated Fund. He would now refer again for one moment to the expense of the new police establishment, in order to say, that by the terms of the Act which he had introduced for the establishment of the new police, an account was to be laid before Parliament, within thirty days of its assembling, of the real amount of the sums paid by each parish on account of the new police. That provision referred to the meeting of Parliament after December, and therefore, when Parliament did again assemble, he should move for that account, with the view of showing that the sums stated to have been paid for the new police had not been really required for that purpose.

Mr. *Warburton* said, that the new police had been very useful in recovering stolen property, which important service had been overlooked. He believed that in one district alone the amount of property recovered was greater than the increase of the assessment.

Mr. *Portman* deprecated the laying any tax on the people of the country, for the support of the Metropolitan Police. He expressed his hope that the expense of the Irish constabulary force would no longer be paid out of the Consolidated Fund, but would be defrayed by local taxation, in the same manner as in London. The people in the western part of the metropolis were much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for the introduction of the new police, and he believed that the investigations of the committee would satisfy the public that he had done a real service to the country in its establishment.

Mr. *Curteis* concurred in protesting against levying any part of the expense for the new police on the country generally. It ought all to be borne by the parishes and property which were protected.

The Petition was then read and ordered to be printed.

GAME LAWS.] The Marquis of *Chandos*, after stating that the Bill which he proposed to bring in was almost similar to the bill which he had introduced on this subject last Session, but which the extreme pressure of public business had prevented him from carrying through, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to alter and amend the Game Laws, and to Legalize the Sale of Game.

Mr. *S. Wortley* should be happy to give his support to the Bill, but would like it better if it went much further than the bill of last Session.

Mr. *Benett*, hoped that no time would be lost in pressing a Bill of this kind through Parliament.

Motion agreed to, and Bill brought in.

ATTESTATION OF POWERS.] The Solicitor General, after a few prefatory observations, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the law of Attesting Instruments by which Powers are executed.

Mr. *Campbell* wished, that the learned Gentleman would postpone his measure, as he thought it would be preferable to take into consideration the whole subject of Powers at once. The distinctions between Powers were immense, and created great injuries, and therefore the subject was deserving the fullest consideration. He hoped to see one general simple law, by which all Wills and Powers might be executed.

The *Solicitor General* wished to effect the immediate object of removing what was mischievous, and could not consent to postpone a measure of such utility because it did not go the whole length to which it might hereafter be carried.

The Bill brought in and read a first time.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, Nov. 19.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. For the abolition of Slavery, by Lord FARNHAM, the Earl of CARLISLE, Lord BEXLEY, the Bishop of LONDON, Earl BATHURST, and

Lord Wharncliffe. For the Repeal of the Union, by the Marquis of Anglesea, from the Inhabitants of Grange Gorman, in the County of Dublin.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, Nov. 19.

Minutes.] Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Hume, the total amount of Fees received by the chief, under, and other Secretaries in the Rolls Court, during the last three years; also for Returns of the number of Orders made, and the Rents and Profits of the Rolls Estates, within the same period; and for various other Returns connected with the Court:—On the Motion of Mr. Ruthven, the Fees and Emoluments of the Officers of the Prerogative Court in Dublin, in the years 1827, 1828, and 1829; also for a Return of the Fees received by Vicars-general in the different Dioceses of Ireland during the last three years.

Petitions presented. For the abolition of Negro Slavery, by Mr. Hyde Villiers, from Wootten-Basset:—By Lord J. Fitzroy, twelve from different bodies of Dissenters:—By Sir J. Astley, from Warminster:—By Sir G. Noel, twenty-eight from different parts of Wales:—By Sir R. Ferguson, from Nottingham:—By Mr. Littleton, from Congleton:—By Sir F. Blake, from Berwick-upon-Tweed:—By Mr. Ward, from Hackney:—By Mr. C. Dundas, two from Richmond, Yorkshire:—By Mr. Jephson, from the County of Cork:—By Sir R. Bateson, from Belfast:—By Mr. Briscoe, from Kingston-upon-Thames, Thames Ditton, and Staines:—By Mr. Rumbold, from Great Yarmouth:—By Mr. Pendarvis, from two places in Cornwall:—By Sir W. Ingilby, from Dissenters of Barton-upon-Humber. For a repeal of the Corn-laws, by Mr. Norman, from persons engaged in the Merthyr-Tydvil Iron Works. By Mr. Wrightson, from Hull, for a repeal of the Duty on Sea-borne Coals. Against the Subletting Act, by Mr. Jephson, from Whitchurch and Gamcloyne. By Mr. O'Connell, from the same place, for a Reform of Parliament. For equality in the Elective Franchise, by Lord Belgrave, from Roman Catholic Inhabitants of Galway.

Repeal of the Union with Ireland.] Lord George Beresford presented a Petition from Carrickbeg, praying for a Repeal of the Legislative Union between England and Ireland.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that he had been instructed by his constituents to support this Petition; with the prayer of which he heartily concurred. There were facts connected with the town from which it came, that well illustrated the effects of the Legislative Union. In the year 1810 there were 7,800 persons supported in that town by the coarse woollen manufacture alone; while at present there were not seven persons maintained by it. This town was placed in the happiest situation for every species of commerce, both externally and internally. It was situated at the junction of three noble rivers, and the finest and richest plain in the world extended from it. Yet it was now in the most miserable state of decay—he would say, decrepitude. He was glad to say, that Protestants as well as Roman Catholics, of Carrickbeg, had united in signing the petition; and he trusted they would join hereafter in all other objects. He was of opinion that the repeal of the Union would be, at least, as advantageous to England as to Ireland. It would free England from the burthen of Irish labourers; which, by depreciating the value of native labour, was, perhaps more influential than any other cause in producing the disturbances in the English counties. Complaints were made in that House last Session as to the pressure of this burthen, they had not been repeated this Session, and if they were, he would say at once, that if the money of Irishmen was spent in Ireland, the income of England would not be taxed for the support of Irish labourers.

Lord *George Beresford* said, he did not concur in the prayer of the petition. He denied that the Union had caused the decay of the woollen manufacture in Carrickbeg. The manufactures had been bad, and although admonished by their customers, the manufacturers continued to supply a bad article; and in consequence of this it was that Carrickbeg lost its owollen trade.

Sir *J. Newport* said, that as he had been prevented by severe indisposition from declaring his opinion on this question when it formerly came under the notice of the House, he would avail himself of that opportunity to state distinctly what it was. His decided conviction was, that the repeal of the Union would be attended by consequences the most deplorable to Ireland. He had always looked upon the Union as a measure which, once passed, was irrevocable; and he knew that it had been so considered by those great and illustrious men who had been its greatest opponents. It had always been asserted by Mr. Grattan, and by the most eminent men who had acted with him, that the measure of the Union, being once passed, could not afterwards be repealed. His opinion was very different from that of the hon. member for Waterford, respecting the effects which the Union had produced upon Ireland. A great many consequences had been attributed to the Union, which did not properly belong to it. He believed that many abuses which existed before the Union, and much of the misgovernment of the local Parliament of Ireland, were falsely attributed to the Union; and when Gentlemen called for the repeal of the Union, he begged leave to remind them, that he was old enough to recollect that many of those who now joined in that cry were formerly the loudest in the reprobation of the local Parliament. He had never had a seat in that Parliament, and therefore he was not liable to any imputations which might be cast upon it for passing the Union. He had always considered that measure as growing out of the circumstances in which the country was then placed; but, whatever might have been his opinion as to the original character of that event, he had never varied for one moment from the opinion, that once having been assented to, it should be looked on as irrevocable. He understood that an hon. Gentleman had said, that never was there one beneficial Act for Ireland passed by the United Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland. Now he (Sir R. Newport) would turn to one Act,—he meant the Corn Intercourse Act of 1806,—which he defied the hon. Gentleman to denounce as an Act not beneficial to Ireland. When he informed the House that that Act alone had doubled the agriculture of Ireland, he claimed merit for the United Parliament so unjustly calumniated, and for himself, who had been the humble instrument of carrying it through that House. That Act he brought as a proof that the interests of Ireland were not neglected in the United Parliament. He begged pardon for intruding so long upon the attention of the House; but he was anxious to declare the opinions which he entertained upon this subject in opposition to many even of his respectable countrymen. He always felt regret when he had occasion to differ from his constituents; but having been returned to that House, he considered himself as the Representative of the people at large, and bound to consult not private but general interests. He had never professed that he would make his sentiments conform on all questions to the wishes of his constituents; on the contrary, he had always avowed, and he still would avow, that he would discharge his duty honourably and fairly according to the dictates of his own unbiassed judgment.

Lord *Nugent* ridiculed the idea that the distress now prevalent in some counties of England was owing in any degree which the House could notice to the irruption of Irish labourers upon their labouring population. The fact was, that the distress felt in the agricultural districts was always felt most severely in the winter. In the summer the value of labour increased, the rate of wages became higher, and the distress gradually vanished; and yet it was the summer months during which the great influx of Irish labourers came to our shores, and the winter months during which they were nearly all absent from them.

Sir *Robert Bateson* condemned the agitation of the question of repealing the Union, as a course calculated, beyond all others, to excite religious and political animosities in Ireland. He contended, that all men of good sense, good feeling, respectable character, and independent property in Ireland, were opposed to the mooting of it. As a proof of his assertion, he alluded to the proceedings of a public meeting recently held at Belfast, where every man of education, intelligence, opulence, and respectability in the town, no matter what were his religious opinions or political creed, had joined in declaring themselves opposed to a repeal of the Union. If such a measure should unfortunately meet with the approbation of Parliament, which he could not by any possibility anticipate, they would have a hundred paupers for every individual pauper whom they had in Ireland at the present moment.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that as this petition came from his constituents, he should move that it be printed. He then told the House that the hon. member for Londonderry (Sir Robert Bateson) was greatly misinformed when he stated that there had been a public meeting at Belfast which had condemned even the agitation of the question of repealing the Union. There had been a meeting of some gentlemen at a room in that town; but there had been no public meeting, and their opponents had taunted those gentlemen for not having dared to convene a public meeting of their townsmen on that question. As to the agitation of the repeal being likely to excite religious and political animosity in Ireland, he begged leave most explicitly to deny it. The fact was directly the reverse; it had contributed, more than any measure with which he was acquainted, to put an end to all religious and personal animosities. As a proof of it, he would mention, that since he had brought forward the agitation of this great and important question, he had had several votes of thanks presented to him by bodies of Orangemen—one in particular by a Mr. Richardson, of Dublin—and of such votes of thanks he was more proud than of any others which he had received in the whole course of his political life. He contended that every man of talent, independence, and wealth, not merely in Dublin, but throughout Ireland, was anxious to obtain a repeal of the Union. He denied that the great men who had opposed the passing of the Union had ever considered it as an irrevocable measure when once passed. He gave that denial to the hon. Baronet's assertion on the authority of a printed speech of Lord Plunkett, who had declared that he would resist the Union to its last stage, and would educate his children in the deepest hostility to it. As to the benefits of the measure he believed they were all confined to absentee landlords. The measure to which the right hon. Baronet had referred had increased the rents of the landlords, but not the comforts of the people. He was sorry to hear the noble Lord condemn the manufacture of Carrickbeg, for his father had appeared at Court in a suit of the cloth made there. He was convinced that the repeal of the Union would be most advantageous to both countries, and it was agitated by the great body of the intelligent people of Ireland.

Sir *R. Bateson* said, he must positively contradict what had fallen from the hon. member for Waterford. There had been a public meeting at Belfast, at which those present came unanimously to a resolution against agitating the question of the repeal of the Union. The great town of Belfast was decidedly against entertaining that mischievous project.

Mr. *Moore* said, that he could not hear the hon. member for Waterford make such statements as he had ventured upon that evening without giving that hon. and learned Member the most positive and the most decided contradiction. The opinions which prevailed in Ireland with regard to the repeal of the Union, were, as every body who was acquainted with Ireland must be aware, directly the reverse of what the hon. and learned Member had represented them to be. Instead of the wealth, and the respectability, and the talent of Ireland being friendly to a repeal of the Union, he would venture to say,—in the presence of Irish Members, and without fear of contradiction from any but the hon. and learned member for Waterford,—that all the genuine commercial activity—all that could be fairly included in the respectability, and all that could be properly called the talent of Ireland—were loud in expressing disapprobation at agitating such a question as the repeal of the Legislative Union between the two countries. The hon. and learned Member had said, that there was, in Dublin, a strong feeling in favour of the repeal of the Union. He not only denied that assertion, but would venture to say, that there was not, in that city, any one intelligent being, capable of understanding the question, and of appreciating the disastrous consequences which must result from the repeal of the Union, who would not be ready to sacrifice all he possessed in order to preserve the Union inviolate. The hon. and learned Member had said, that the Orangemen of Ireland were favourable to the repeal of the Union; but this was perhaps the most unfounded of the statements which the hon. and learned Member had made, and he begged to give it the most broad and the most unqualified contradiction. Among the lowest class of the population of Ireland, there might, very likely, be that feeling which the hon. and learned Member had vainly endeavoured to persuade the House pervaded the respectable and intelligent Members of the Irish community. And it was no wonder that among the lower classes this feeling existed, for great pains had been taken to inculcate delusions upon them. The first of these delusions was, that the repeal of the Union must be carried, and that nothing could prevent it being carried. Now, when this representation, which they who made it must know to be untrue, was made to an ignorant and easily-excited population—and when the examples of Paris and of Brussels were held up to them as examples which they should imitate, he would put it to the House, whether the most dangerous consequences were not likely to ensue. He should not have been tempted to make these observations, if the hon. and learned member for Waterford had given them any hope that, by a specific motion, they should have an opportunity of dispelling this delusion by their votes. The hon. and learned Member would not give them any such opportunity, and therefore he could only hope, that every Member of that House, and every respectable member of the Irish community, would embrace all opportunities that might occur of expressing their decided disapprobation of agitating so hopeless and so mischievous a project as the repeal of the Legislative Union with Ireland.

Sir *A. Chichester* rose for the purpose of contradicting the hon. and learned member for Waterford, who had said that no public meeting had been called at Belfast on this subject.

Mr. *O'Connell*.—I did not say that no public meeting had been called. I said that no meeting had been called by public advertisement.

Sir *A. Chichester* said, that a most numerous and respectable meeting at Belfast had come unanimously to a resolution against discussing this question, because they were convinced that the discussion of it would be highly injurious. He could answer for this being the opinion of the north of Ireland.

Colonel *O'Grady* sincerely deprecated the agitation of this question. He could not concur with the hon. member for Dublin in wishing that it were brought before the House by a specific motion, because he thought that by that means the agitation of it in Ireland would be increased.

Petition to be printed.

CRIMINAL LAW.] Mr. *Brougham* said, he held in his hand a petition which he felt highly honoured by having committed to his charge. It was upon the question of punishment of death for offences where violence had not been committed. It came from a body of men liable to serve upon Grand Juries in London; and amongst the names that stood forward on the list were those of seven gentlemen who had served as Foremen during the last year. The petition, he stated, was written with distinguished ability and great force, and he would fain have it read at length if he could venture to trespass upon the time of that House; he would content himself with reading the prayer of the petition, which was, that the law which prescribed the punishment of death for offences in which violence had not been committed was detrimental to public justice. He considered this petition worthy the best attention of the House, from the high authority of the petitioners upon the subject to which they directed their attention. It was evident, from the statement, that great difficulty arose from the scruples of Jurors to convict, and that thus the guilty frequently escaped punishment altogether. He believed the right hon. Baronet (Sir R. Peel) agreed with him in the principle, though they perhaps, differed in some matters of detail.

Mr. *Ward* corroborated the statement of the hon. and learned Member; and said, that he heartily concurred in the prayer of the petition.

Mr. *Denman* also supported the prayer of the petition. He considered it most important, and that it required the best attention of the House. It clearly showed the painful alternative to which Jurors were exposed—that of unjustly and unrighteously condemning a man to death, or else that of violating their conscientious feelings, by deciding contrary to evidence.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN GIBRALTAR.] Mr. Ward presented a petition from a Gentleman named Augustin Galleano, upon the important subject of the state of the Judicature there. The petitioner complained of a decision of the Court there, against which he had not been allowed to appeal.

Mr. *Brougham* said, that he had been requested to support the prayer of the petition. The case of the petitioner was peculiar: An action had been brought against him for a sum of 250*l.*; he complained that injustice had been done him; but, in consequence of the amount, he was not allowed an appeal against the decision. He believed, that in this instance a trick had been resorted to for the purpose of preventing an appeal, because the amount of the money really in dispute was above double the sum for which the action was brought, and by the law of appeals, no appeal could be brought in a case where the demand was less than 500*l.*

Sir *G. Murray* could say nothing of the facts alleged in this petition, as he had had no intimation of its being about to be presented.

Mr. *Brougham* was aware of that circumstance, but vouched for the accuracy of the statement, and for the bad effect of the limitation upon the right of appeal.

The *Solicitor General* said, that if the objection of the hon. and learned Gentleman was allowed to its full extent, there would be no limitation to the right of appeal. It would go even to destroy every subordinate Court which existed on the principle of limitation in the amount for which actions were to be brought.

Mr. *Brougham* did not wish to destroy that principle, but to leave a discretion in he Court of Appeal, that the principle might not be converted into an abuse.

Mr. *Hume* said, that this case was only one of the very numerous instances of the evils of allowing the colonies to be governed by orders in Council. Until a different principle prevailed, abuses would continue, and the colonies would be expensive to this country, without enjoying prosperity themselves.

Petition to be printed.

CORPORATION ABUSES (IRELAND).] Mr. *Leader* presented a Petition from certain inhabitants of the town of Galway, which stated, that although the disqualifications generally affecting his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects had been repealed, yet the Roman Catholic mercantile and trading classes of Galway still continued an isolated exception to the general boon, being as yet excluded from the elective franchise, as enjoyed by their ancestors in common with Protestants before the enactment of the penal code, and as exercised even at the present day by their Protestant fellow-citizens. The petition also stated, that since 1793 the franchise had fallen into the hands of an absentee peasantry, at present amounting to nearly 2,000 in number, to the entire destruction of any power in the Protestant mercantile classes, and to the utter exclusion of the Roman Catholics, who could not become free, from the want of Protestant freemen to whom they might serve apprenticeships. He had presented a petition against the Corporation of Athlone, and the present was the second intrusted to him against corporate usurpation in Ireland, and the conversion of public funds to private purposes. A third petition he had also to present, but which he should for the present abstain from doing, as he intended to make a specific motion to have it referred to a Select Committee when a Government was formed. That petition was from the city of Kilkenny, offering proof at the bar of the House that, like what had taken place in Galway, land, of the clear yearly value of 10,000*l.* had been, since the Union, converted to any purpose but that of sheltering the houseless poor, or giving employment to the people, as originally intended by their charters. Here was an instance of one of the most ancient and opulent cities in Ireland, and of a maritime town, admirably situated for foreign and domestic trade, both crushed in their industry, and actually chained down to poverty, by corporate usurpation and abominable dereliction of trust. If, since the Union, the Corporations of Galway and Kilkenny had expended these sums, which would have amounted to more than half a million, on the improvement of their ancient cities, and had by their example animated others to spend larger sums, the consequence might have been, that the Members for Ireland would now have had to represent one of the happiest, instead of one of the most destitute countries in Europe, and need not entertain apprehensions of having all the popularity of their lives sacrificed for not urging the repeal of a Union, which many were disposed to believe had emboldened these Corporations to violate their charters, and despoil the people of their liberties and their wealth. He hoped a new King, a new Parliament, and a new Ministry, would no longer delude both countries by voluminous reports, but fearlessly declare, that the entire exports of the landed produce of Ireland were little enough to meet the claims on the country from absentees and the taxes; and that it was full time for corporate funds to be husbanded for the interests of the people, local taxation to be reduced, and tithes to be commuted.

Sir *John Bourke* supported the prayer of the petition. He had been also intrusted with a petition on the same subject from Galway, and he had only deferred presenting it in order that he might know whether it was the intention of his hon. friend, the member for Limerick, to bring forward again the Galway Franchise Bill.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that it was his intention to bring that Bill forward again this Session.

Petition to be printed.

OPPRESSION OF THE PEASANTRY—IRELAND.] Mr. *O'Connell* presented a Petition from the same places, complaining of the evils of absenteeism, and praying for a repeal of the Union. He took that opportunity to state, that he now held in his hand documents confirming his statement as to the serving of notices upon the estate of Earl Fitzwilliam, in the county Wicklow. Instead of 800 persons having got notice to quit (which was his original statement), it would appear from the documents which had been forwarded to him, that 1,544 persons had received such notices, and their names and residences were furnished to him. He had also received documents fully confirming his statement as to the estate of Lord Rathdown. He had also received one of the circulars which had been sent round by Lord Fitzwilliam's agent to the tenantry, informing them, that if any of them had sublet, they should not have their leases renewed. He had submitted those documents to the hon. member for Wicklow (Mr. James Grattan), and he had offered to lay them before the hon. member for Northamptonshire (Lord Althorp.)

Mr. *J. Grattan* did not mean to deny, that what the hon. and learned Member had stated with respect to the notices was fact; but it was not the mere consequence of the Subletting Act, nor was that fact sufficient to justify any imputation on the landlord. It was impossible, in the present state of the law, to relet the farms without giving this notice, in order to be strictly regular; but though these notices had been given, he denied that 800 or 1,500 persons had been turned off the estate. So far from it, indeed, he had the best reason for believing that only one of the tenants on whom notice was served was likely to quit. He took that opportunity of bearing his sincere testimony to the excellent character and conduct of Mr. Challoner, the agent for the noble Earl. He had had amply opportunity of witnessing the manner in which that gentleman managed the noble Earl's estate, and nothing could be more excellent or more liberal. Mr. Challoner had this last summer spent a very large sum of money in improving the estate, and the consequence was, that the peasantry in that neighbourhood had the advantage of good employment.

Sir *H. Hardinge* reiterated the statement contained in the letter of Archdeacon Trench, with regard to the estate of Lord Rathdown, and at the same time said, he should be most happy to see the documents spoken of by the hon. member for Waterford.

Mr. *Doherty* deprecated the practice of introducing such discussions upon the presentation of petitions; and, above all, he deprecated the practice of the hon. member for Waterford, in thus constantly recurring to statements which had been repeatedly contradicted. Was that House to be a court of appeal for the peasantry in these matters, and what sort of tribunal, he would ask, would the House of Commons become, if, night after night, statements should be repeated after the flattest contradictions had been given to them—contradictions so direct and positive, that they must come home to the heart of every one who felt like a gentleman? A detailed statement had been received by the hon. member for Youghall from Mr. Challoner, which amply refuted the attacks directed against him, and reflected the highest credit on him.

Mr. *Hume* wished to know to whom were the peasantry of Ireland to prefer their complaints, if not to that House? He defended the conduct of the hon. member for Waterford, and contended that, as the serving of the notices had been admitted by the hon. member for Wicklow, the statement was untouched, and that the hon. Gentleman, the Solicitor General for Ireland, appeared to be ignorant of the facts of the case. His hon. friend, the member for Waterford, had been accused of stating falsely, that 800 notices to quit had been served on Earl Fitzwilliam's tenantry; he had accordingly brought documents to prove that 1,500 notices had been served; the accuracy of those documents was not denied by the hon. member for Wicklow, and therefore his hon. friend had completely made out his case, notwithstanding the loud and confident assertions of Gentlemen opposite.

Mr. *Doherty* explained. He had never meant to assert that the people should not have the right to petition that House.

Mr. *G. Dawson* observed, that upon the first night of the Session the hon. member for Waterford had asserted, in his speech upon the Address, not that notices had been served upon 800 families upon the Fitzwilliam estate, but that 800 families had been actually turned out from their homes, and sent adrift upon the world. The learned member for Yorkshire, in adverting to that statement upon the same evening, said, that it was the most horrible picture he had ever heard drawn of the condition of any country, and that such a state of things should not be allowed to exist in any portion of the civilized world. Such was the impression, too, which the statement of the hon. member for Waterford made then upon the House. That hon. Member afterwards retracted the statement as to 800 families, and confined it to 800 persons; and he had now retracted his statement as to the fact, for it appeared that the notices of which he spoke were not real ejectments. The object, however, was obtained by the extensive circulation of such inflammatory statements, in quarters where the retractations of them, and the answers to them, might never reach to counteract the misrepresentation.

Mr. *O'Connell* replied, that he had all along asserted that 800 persons had received notice to quit; he had therefore retracted nothing, and the documents which had been furnished to him had nearly doubled that statement. He congratulated the House on its readiness to lead on a cheer against him, and assured the Members that such cheers gave him a proud conviction that he had done his duty to his country.

The petition was ordered to lie on the Table, and to be printed.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE BILL.] On the Motion of the Attorney General, The Report of the Committee on this Bill was brought up.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, he was sorry that the learned Solicitor General was not in the House, as he would have another opportunity of admiring that beautiful thing which he called the science of the law. Here was an amendment in the law for altering the essoign day, and he should be glad if the House could be made to know what it meant. Yet the law was praised because the hon. member for Middlesex could not understand it. An excellent thing it was for the conjurors who did understand it; but those who went to have their fortunes told had not much reason to rejoice. But even the conjurors themselves were sometimes at fault; for the Attorney General framed a bill last Session, exactly three months ago, and he now wished to make an amendment in it, in the necessity of which he perfectly concurred.

The *Attorney General* said, the hon. Member was a man of education, and he should have apprehended that few Gentlemen who aspired to speak in that House could be ignorant of what an essoign day was; but, since he supposed that others were, he would beg to explain the intention of the Bill. The hon. Member seemed to complain of his having removed that expression from the Bill, but in professing to criticise it, he shewed that he was not master of its meaning. He said, that the Bill had existed three months, and that already it had been found necessary to alter it; but, in fact, the part of the Bill to be altered had not yet come into operation, and would not till January next. A clause relating to the same subject as that now under discussion was introduced as a provisional clause into the Bill, the fixing the day being left to the discretion of the Judges. When, however, the Bill arrived in the House of Peers, the noble Lord who presided in the Court of King's Bench thought it better, instead of this temporary clause, leaving the matter to the Judges, that a precise day should be fixed, and so accordingly the Bill was passed; but he had since become aware that the Bill would be better as it originally stood, or that the return of the original writ should be put upon the same footing as the others, and he agreed in the opinion of that noble Lord. To carry that into effect, or restore the Bill to its original state was the object of the Bill, then before the House.

Mr. *Hume* felt obliged to the hon. and learned Gentleman for his statement, from which it appeared, that the Bill, instead of having been in operation three months, had not yet come into operation, but required another bill to enable it to move. If the hon. and learned Gentleman knew that this provision was necessary, why did he not introduce it at the time? His present measure was nothing more than a patching up of an incomplete bill. The public prints said, that it would be impossible to carry the learned Gentleman's measure into effect without amendment; and he apparently had taken the hint from the public papers. He was right in bringing these amendments forward; but he should not take credit for them. If the Attorney General and other law-officers of the new Administration should not know what they had to do better than those of the retiring Administration, one-half of the time of the House would be thrown away in amending the blunders and mistakes committed in the other half.

The *Attorney General* reiterated his statement that the Amendment was not of any clause introduced into the Bill in that House, but of a clause introduced by the Chief Justice in the House of Lords.

LABOURING POOR.] Lord *Nugent* rose to move for leave to bring in a Bill for the better providing Employment for the Labouring Poor, at fair and adequate wages. In doing so he observed, that the Bill which he was about to introduce was almost word for word the same as the

Bill which he had carried to an advanced stage last Session, and which had been referred to a committee. The first clause of the Bill was the only one that was mandatory, and it was intended to do away with the system called roundsmen—a system which existed in a great many parishes, and which increased the rates, whilst it degraded the population. The remaining clauses of the Bill were only permissive to vestries to establish, by a majority of two-thirds, a common rate of labour. This would be the means to bring labour to a fair and open competition. He wished to avoid all descriptions of that distress which had existed last year in the county in which he resided, and in which labour was in a very unnatural state. He should not wish to express one-half of what he knew upon the subject, for his object was to mitigate and not to increase those bitter things which were felt on both sides by the classes interested in the cultivation of the soil. During the severity of winter, 4*s.* 6*d.* was the weekly wages of labourers in the county in which he resided, and in many parishes the wages were only 3*s.* 6*d.*, whilst the peck of flour, the starving ratio, the *minimum* of human existence, cost 3*s.* During all this distress, the calendar at the assizes and the quarter Sessions at the close of the winter was lighter than it had been for many years. He should not go further into the subject, as no opposition was intended to the Bill.

Mr. *Ruthven* wished that the Bill could be extended to Ireland, though the Irish people ought to be obliged to the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Peel) for what he had done for them, as well as for the fairness and candour, with which he had always avowed his opposition.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* bore testimony to the truth and good faith which the right hon. Gentleman had always observed towards the House. He differed from that right hon. Gentleman on many political questions, but there was no public man whose integrity he more highly esteemed.

Mr. *Briscoe* highly approved of the Bill, and contended that parishes ought to have the power of employing poor on waste lands. There was no surer criterion of the strength and prosperity of a country than the condition of the labouring and middle classes. He wished each man also to have a small piece of ground.

Sir *J. Shelley* was convinced that the measure would be practically useful in the part of the country with which he was best acquainted.

Mr. *John Johnstone* knew from authentic information, that the county of Sussex was in a most deplorable state. Large bodies of labourers were going about compelling the farmers to give higher wages, and the farmers were unable to resist. Some measures should be speedily adopted.

Mr. *Curteis* could not attribute the state of the labouring poor to the conduct of Government, and he was convinced that it would be impossible to do any thing for the poor, unless the higher agricultural classes did something for them. The Bill could not be extended to Ireland, as no Poor-laws existed in that country. He hoped that the Bill would have the effect anticipated, and whoever might be the new Ministers, he was confident that they could not stand unless they did something for the landed interest and the distressed peasantry.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* was more disposed to listen to those who suggested remedies for the evils, than to those who expatiated on them. It was not by Acts of Parliament that the distress could be remedied. All classes must lend a contributory hand, and especially landlords. Those who proposed that the salaries of Ministers should be reduced to the standard of 1792, should contrast their own rent-roll at present with the amount they received in 1792. Farmers could not afford to pay war-rents, war-tithes, and war-wages. Landlords must make large concessions, and the benefit would soon be felt and willingly acknowledged. He trusted that the clergy would practise the virtues of charity and forbearance, as well as inculcate them weekly.

Mr. *Curteis* said, that the rents in the county he represented had generally been reduced one-third.

Mr. *Long Wellesley* was understood to speak in favour of the Church Establishment, and to reprobate any modification of the tithe-system that might possibly be inconsistent with its security.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* protested against the doctrine that the landlords and gentry of England were indifferent to the state of their tenantry. The rent of land was regulated by the laws of supply and demand, like all other commodities; and if humanity did not induce landlords to lower rents to the state of the market, good sense very soon would.

Mr. *Hume* thought it preposterous to talk of reducing the rent of lands to what it had been in 1792, since, in the interval, a great deal of capital had been laid out in its improvement. Land that was worth 30*l.* per acre in 1792, was now worth perhaps 60*l.* per acre. Rent was like the price of every thing else, it could not be controlled by law, but must be regulated by demand and supply. All the evils of the country had sprung from the country gentlemen supporting the Government in its extravagance. If Government would but take off taxes, all classes would participate in the relief, and that was the best remedy that could be applied. He hoped that the House would take care to have a cheap Government—that every individual employed should be paid, but paid no more than their services deserved. The hon. member for St. Ives (Mr. Long Wellesley) was anxious to support the supremacy of the Church; but the Church had long been predominant, and it ought to be subordinate, for its supremacy had vitiated its power of doing good. Large payments had prevented the clergy from instructing the people. The best measure would be to abolish tithes, or to put them on the same footing with those of Scotland, where the tithe-payer knew not the renter. If tithes were not moderated, the clergy would soon get none at all. The clerical tithes were not exacted with half the rigour of the lay tithes, and yet they excited greater irritation and discontent. The Government ought to remove such a source of obloquy, and apportion tithes according to the duty performed. In his opinion, a clergyman of 2,000*l.* a-year was no more fit for a parish priest than a nobleman was fit for a menial servant.

Mr. *Ridley Colborne* was glad to have the subject of the Poor-laws brought forward; but it was attended with innumerable difficulties, and he much doubted the beneficial effects of the present measure.

Mr. *Long Wellesley* explained, that he wished the tithe system reformed, but the supremacy of the Church maintained.

Lord *Nugent*, in reply, observed, that having in the few words with which he troubled the House in introducing his Motion, avoided, and in some degree deprecated, any reference to irritating topics, he could but express his regret at the course which the discussion had taken. One hon. Member complained that a great portion of the evils under which the country suffered, arose from the neglect of the landlord to his tenantry, and of the clergyman to his flock, and he had dwelt on the importance of these classes attending to the comforts of the labourers. His Bill had no relation to those subjects. Although he might regret that neglect occurred, and that evil arose from it, it was not his intention to interfere with the conduct of either of those classes. He was convinced that his measure would have a most beneficial effect on the well-being of the agricultural and labouring population of this country, an object which he was ardently desirous of promoting. He had listened with considerable pleasure to the hon. member for Surrey; but the suggestion which he threw out could not be brought within the present Bill, though he should be most willing to adopt any recommendation consistent with its principle. At the same time he must profess that he should be most willing to give him every assistance in carrying into effect the plan which he adverted to. He had seen the beneficial results of granting small portions of land to the labouring population. He had even tried it himself on a small scale, and found it work as well as he could expect. From all that he had experienced, he was satisfied that the more extensive adoption of it would be attended with the most beneficial results. He entertained a thorough conviction that it would be advantageous to allow parishes to give small portions of land to their labourers, but as that was entirely distinct from the principle of his Bill, he had said nothing respecting it. The hon. member for Surrey might perhaps require to be informed, that one of the greatest impediments to the success of a measure was endeavouring to make it comprise too much. This was particularly the case as regarded the Poor-laws; and if a Bill contained more than one remedy for one obvious abuse, there was no chance of its success. The most sure mode of removing the evils of the Poor-laws was, by applying a practical remedy to each single abuse. It would be impossible to carry a Bill for remedying all the evils of those laws: and therefore it was better to amend the system gradually. His Bill accordingly was confined to the putting a stop to one of the most obvious and most pernicious evils of the Poor-laws. He merely asked the House to abolish the detestable practice of paying the wages of the labourer out of the poor-rates, instead of his employer paying him. The other clauses of the Bill related to allowing parishes to establish a labour-rate for the employment of the poor who become chargeable. These were all the points contained in the Bill, to which he trusted the House would give its assent. His object was, to give labour a free market, and to remove every impediment to the labourer's getting a high rate of wages if he could. He was aware that there were large districts in this country in which the evil of paying the labourers out of the poor-rates did not prevail, and in which his Bill, therefore, would be inapplicable; but he did not conceive it expedient, on that account, to confine its operation to particular districts. He was aware that there was already a law on the subject, but not sufficiently strong to put a stop to the evil. He wished to declare, that such a mode of paying labour was illegal, and also to attach a penalty to the non-observance of the law. He heard with regret the observations which fell from the hon. member for Colchester, and he lamented that he should cast imputations on so large a class of persons as the landlords of England. He was convinced that they felt much concerned for the labouring classes, and were willing to make every proper sacrifice for their relief. He could not agree with that hon. Member in designating them as a useless and unfeeling body. The hon. Member stated, that the law of landlord and tenant was a system made entirely in favour of the former, and against the latter. He denied this to be the case; but if it were, what that had to do with the subject before the House he was at a loss to conceive.

Leave given, and Bill brought in and read a first time.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, Nov. 22.

Minutes.] The House of Lords was crowded with strangers, anxious to see the Right Hon. H. Brougham take his seat upon the Woolsack, as Lord Chancellor, and as a Peer of Parliament. The patent, however, by which the right hon. Gentleman is created a Peer, had not reached the hands of Mr. Courtenay, the Clerk of Parliament, at 4 o'clock; and, in consequence, Mr. Brougham could not that day take the oaths as a Peer. By virtue of his office as Lord Chancellor, the right hon. Gentleman is a Privy Counsellor, and also Speaker of the House of Lords. As soon as prayers were over, he took his seat upon the Woolsack, and received the congratulations of his friends. He had only power however, to put the question, and could not, even if he had been desirous, have taken any share in the Debate.

The New Ministers, Earl Grey, the Marquis of Lansdown, the Earl of Carlisle, Viscount Goderich, and Baron Durham, took their seats upon the Treasury Bench.*

---

* It will be seen by the Debates of the 16th, that the Ministers, in consequence of the defeat on the 15th, resigned their offices. The following changes were accordingly made:—

Offices	Appointments	In the room of
First Lord of the Treasury	Earl Grey	Duke of Wellington
Lord Chancellor	Lord Brougham & Vaux	Lord Lyndhurst
Lord President of the Privy Council	Marquis of Lansdown	Earl Bathurst
Privy Seal	Lord Durham	Earl of Rosslyn
Home Secretary	Viscount Melbourne	Sir R. Peel
Under Secretary Home	Hon. G. Lamb	Mr. Yates Peel
Colonial Secretary	Viscount Goderich	Sir G. Murray
Under Secretary Colonies	Lord Howick	Mr. Horace Twiss
Foreign Secretary	Viscount Palmerston	Earl of Aberdeen
Chancellor of the Exchequer	Viscount Althorp	Mr. Goulburn
First Lord of the Admiralty	Sir J. Graham	Viscount Melville
President of the Board of Control	Rt. hon. C. Grant	Lord Ellenborough
President of the Board of Trade, and Master of the Mint	Lord Auckland	Mr. Herries
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster	Lord Holland	Mr. Arbuthnot
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland	Marquis of Anglesea	Duke of Northumberland
Lord Chamberlain	Duke of Devonshire	Earl of Jersey
Postmaster-General	Duke of Richmond	Duke of Manchester
Master of the Horse	Earl of Albemarle	Duke of Leeds
Lord Steward	Marquis Wellesley	Duke of Buckingham
Judge Advocate	Mr. R. Grant	Sir J. Beckett
Woods and Forests	Hon. A. Ellis	Lord Lowther
Paymaster-General	Lord J. Russell	Mr. Calcraft
Vice-President of the Board of Trade, and Treasurer of the Navy	Mr. Chas. P. Thomson	F. Lewis
Secretary for Ireland	Mr. E. G. S. Stanley	Sir H. Hardinge
Master-General of the Ordnance	Sir W. Gordon	Viscount Beresford
Surveyor-General of the Ordnance	Sir R. Spencer	Sir H. Fane
Secretaries of the Treasury	Mr. Edward Ellice	Mr. Joseph Planta
	Mr. Spring Rice	Mr. Geo. R. Dawson

The Duke of WELLINGTON took his place on the first Opposition Bench.

Lord TENTERDEN'S various Bills, the Judgment and Execution Bill, the Interpleaders' Bill, the Prohibition and Mandamus Bill, the Arbitration Bill, and the Witness Examination Bill, went respectively through Committees.

Petitions presented. Against Colonial Slavery, from the Wesleyan Methodists and other bodies of Protestant Dissenters in different parts of the country, by Earl SPENCER, the Marquis of CLEVELAND, the Earl of CARLISLE, the Earl of ROSSLYN, Earl RODEN, the Earl of SHAFTESBURY, Earl GROSVENOR, Lord SUFFIELD, and Lord WHARNCLIFFE. For the improvement of Agriculture, by the Marquis of SALISBURY, from Sir John Sinclair. For the repeal of the Duty on Coals, by the Earl of SHAFTESBURY, from Wisbeach and Holsworth.

THE POOR LAWS.] The Marquis of Salisbury having in the early part of the afternoon postponed his motion for the appointment of a Committee on the Poor-laws, as soon as the usual hour (five o'clock) for transacting public business arrived,

Lord *Suffield*, after observing that it was not usual in that House to transact public business before five o'clock, declared his acquiescence in the postponement of the motion of the noble Marquis. He thought that nothing could be more improper or more indecorous than to hamper a Ministry, so lately formed, by the immediate introduction of any subject surrounded with so many difficulties as was that of his noble friend; but as, at the same time, it happened to be a motion of such importance that all others sank into insignificance beside it, he trusted the noble Marquis would pledge himself, in all cases, and under all circumstances, to bring forward his motion for the Committee on Monday next.

The Marquis of *Salisbury* apologised for having given the notice of postponement so early. He stated, it was his firm intention to bring forward his motion on the day he had named, (Monday next) and he added, that he hoped for the assistance and support of the Government.

MINISTERIAL DECLARATIONS.] The Marquis of *Lansdown*, in presenting a Petition from Glasgow, praying for Parliamentary Reform, was understood to state that he was anxious to say a few words to their Lordships. He had been intrusted with several petitions, which he was accidentally prevented from presenting on a former evening, by the speech of the noble and learned Lord then on the Woolsack, respecting the introduction of the Regency Bill; and he trusted that even now, after having been raised to office, he might stand excused in presenting petitions, which expressed an anxiety more or less strong for Parliamentary Reform, if he stated the terms on which he would have previously promoted this measure. There was no noble Lord then present who could be more desirous than he was to preserve our settled institutions; but with respect to these petitions, he was bound to state, that so far he agreed with the sentiments they professed, as to be of opinion that some amendment was necessary in the representation of the people of this country; and he trusted that when they were called to the consideration of this most important and anxious subject, they would take care that no supposed amendment should be made for the sake of change, but that the change made should be, in fact, a substantial improvement. He felt that in stating that some amendment in the representation was necessary, he was borne out by the present condition of the constituency of the country. When he looked to the great interests—commercial and manufacturing, consisting as they did of large bodies of well-informed and enlightened persons, which had been called into existence by the prosperity of the country, by the increased diffusion of wealth, and by the progress of science and discovery—when

---

Master of the King's Buck-Hounds	Viscount Anson	Lord Maryborough
Attorney General	Mr. Denman (knighted)	Sir J. Scarlett
Solicitor General	Mr. Horne (knighted)	Sir E. B. Sugden
Lord Chancellor for Ireland	Lord Plunkett	Sir A. Hart
Attorney General for Ireland	Mr. Pennefather	Mr. Joy
Solicitor General for Ireland		Mr. Doherty
Lord Advocate for Scotland	Mr. Francis Jeffery.	Sir John Rae
Solicitor General for Ditto	Mr. James Cockburn	Mr. Hope

New Treasury Board.—Charles, Earl Grey; the Right Hon. John Chas. Spencer (commonly called Viscount Althorp); the Right Hon. George, Baron Nugent; Robert Vernon Smith, Esq.; Francis Thornhill Baring, Esq.; and the Hon. George Ponsonby.

New Admiralty Board.—The Right Hon. Sir James Robert George Graham, Bart.; Sir Thomas Masterman Hardy, Bart., K.C.B., Rear-Admiral of the White Squadron of his Majesty's Fleet; the Hon. George Heneage Lawrence Dundas, C.B., Rear-Admiral of the Blue Squadron of his Majesty's Fleet; Sir Samuel John Brooke Pechell, Bart., C.B., Captain in the Royal Navy; and the Hon. George Barrington, Captain in the Royal Navy.

he recollected that those great and useful bodies were without direct connexion with the Legislature (on which direct connexion, for all classes of the people, he believed the safety—nay, even the existence of the Constitution depended,) he could not bring himself to think Reform unnecessary, and the more especially when he considered that there were parts of the country which had not a share amounting to the shadow of a shade in the representation. He was, therefore, a friend to amendment in the representative system; but, with all his feelings in favour of improvement, he was prepared, for one, to say, that there was no Reform in Parliament which did not leave to the property and knowledge of the country—those two great elements of civilized society—a share, and he would even say, a preponderating share, in the representation; there was no such Reform which, as an honest man, he could recommend or support. But, for the reasons he had stated, the subject would be one of anxious deliberation to Parliament; and perhaps he might be allowed to take that opportunity of declaring, that however flattered and honoured he might have felt himself by the gracious kindness of his Majesty, in raising him to a place in his councils, yet he could not, in justice to himself, have availed himself of his Majesty's confidence and condescension, if he had not had reason to confide both in the inclination and the means of his noble friend now at the head of the Government—if he had not reason to place entire confidence in the assurance that he would turn his powerful mind, not only to the question of Parliamentary Reform, but to many other considerations which now pressed upon the attention of the Administration, at a time of great emergency. Having now stated what his feelings were, and the confidence he had in the intentions of his noble friend, he had only to add, that he would turn his mind to this subject, and endeavour, as far as in him lay, to do justice to the people, and preserve the institutions of the country. The noble Marquis concluded by presenting the petition.

Earl *Grey* then spoke to the following effect:—My Lords, I have heard, with much satisfaction, what has been just said by my noble friend; and, my Lords, I feel inclined to take the occasion of what has fallen from him, to state very shortly, which I hope will not be unbecoming in me, the principles upon which I, in obedience to his Majesty's commands, have accepted the high office to which, in the most kind and gracious manner, he has been pleased to call me, and in which my best services are due. My Lords, on the very important subject to which the petition refers, it cannot be necessary for me to say much: My opinions on this question have been long made known to your Lordships, and have been explained, both to your Lordships and the country, on more than one occasion. It is not long since I felt called on, indeed, again to explain them at some length to your Lordships in the debate which took place on the first day of this Session. I then stated, and I now repeat my conviction that it is necessary that the Government (by whom alone the question can be satisfactorily taken up and settled) should take into immediate consideration the state of the representation, with a view to the correction of those defects which have been occasioned in it by the operation of time, and with a view to the re-establishment of that confidence upon the part of the people, which I am afraid Parliament does not at present enjoy to the full extent that is essential for the welfare and safety of the country and the preservation of the Government. I said, too, my Lords, at the same time, and I now repeat it, that I will not support any of those fanciful and extensive plans which are supported by persons out of doors, and which would lead, not to reform, but to confusion. I do not support—I never have supported universal suffrage and annual Parliaments, nor any other of those very extensive changes which have been, I regret to say, too much promulgated in this country, and promulgated by gentlemen from whom better things might have been expected. I wish to stand upon the true principles of the Constitution, but some Reform being necessary—the principle on which I wish to regulate it, and I am sure your Lordships cannot fail to see, that to fix that principle is a task of no slight difficulty—the principle, my Lords, which I should lay down to regulate Reform, will be to do as much as may be necessary to secure to the people their due influence in the great council in which they are more particularly represented, and by that means to restore satisfaction and confidence in the decision of the Legislature, without, which the

Government cannot proceed in comfort and safety. Reform to this extent my Lords,—and if it be not carried to this extent, it will be inefficient—I wish to see effected, but effected with due and fitting regard to the settled institutions of the country. The earnest desire to embark in sudden change, which must inevitably produce disturbance, I do not share—on the contrary, I reject it utterly. My Lords, I do not know that it is necessary for me to say any more on the subject. These observations are undoubtedly of a very general nature, but it is obviously impossible for me now to lay before your Lordships the details of any plan. Suffice it, therefore, for me to say, in general terms, that I acknowledge the necessity of a Reform in the Representation, and that it is my anxious wish to regulate that Reform in such a manner as to restore confidence and satisfaction upon the part of the people without interfering with anything that exists in conformity to the established principles of the Constitution. I am not disposed to meddle with the settled institutions of the country, and I am altogether averse to those fanciful alterations, which, if they could be carried into effect, would produce no result excepting that of occasioning a lamentable collision between the several orders of the State, the firm union and mutual interests of which it will ever be my object to maintain. So much, my Lords, with regard to this subject, on which it will be only necessary for me to add, that before I endeavoured to unite all those, whom I considered most likely to advance the interests of the country, to myself, in his Majesty's Councils, I had his most gracious sanction to be allowed, at a proper period, to submit a measure of this nature and with this object, for the approval of his Majesty, who has authorised me to declare at a proper period, that to the principle of such a measure he is not opposed; but I am sure your Lordships will, at once, understand that notwithstanding the most extensive industry upon our part, the question is one not lightly to be taken up, being, as it is, one requiring much time and consideration. Besides, my Lords, the load of official business to which we shall be subjected, must be such that I cannot be expected, at this moment, to have any specific motion to submit, or to be able to submit a complete plan on so complicated a subject at a few short hours notice. My Lords, there are one or two other subjects on which I conceive it will be becoming in me to say a few words We have succeeded to the administration of affairs in a season of unparalleled difficulty. All I can say is, that to the subject of the motion for Monday next, to which I am first naturally attracted by the observations of the noble Baron, all I can say is, that I look to it with the utmost anxiety, from the reference it bears to the labouring classes, and the whole situation of the country. It is only within the last three hours that my colleagues and I have been installed in our respective offices as Members of his Majesty's Government, and we have yet had no access to official documents, and have received no information respecting the measures which have been pursued by our predecessors. Under these circumstances, I can only promise that the state of the country shall be made the object of our immediate, our diligent and unceasing attention—of our first and most anxious attention; for there is nothing my Lords which so imperatively calls for the most unceasing and diligent attention on the part of the Government as the present state of the labouring classes, in several of the agricultural districts. I have, therefore, my Lords, summoned a council for this evening, to consider what may be done with greatest speed and effect. To relieve the distress which now so unhappily exists in different parts of the country, will be the first and most anxious object of our deliberations; but I here declare for myself (and in doing so, I also speak for my colleagues)—I declare that it is my determined resolution, wherever outrages are perpetrated, or excesses committed, to suppress them with severity and vigour. Severity is, in the first instance, the only remedy which can be applied to such disorders with success; and which can guard against the future recurrence of them. Although we are most anxious to relieve the distress of the people who are suffering, let them, therefore, be well assured they shall find no want of firm resolution upon our part to repress criminal designs, and to punish the guilty. I am desirous, then, my Lords, that the people—though God forbid I should bring so groundless a charge against the people of England, or attribute to them feelings and conduct in which alone a small portion of the people in some of the districts indulge—

I am desirous, my Lords, that that portion of the people should be told, that the effect of their proceedings is this—that while they complain of want of employment, they destroy the very means by which they will be benefitted; and I am desirous that they should learn, that the Government, although it commiserates their situation, is firmly resolved not to connive at their excesses. So far, my Lords, respecting our most pressing domestic concerns; but there is another subject closely, I might say intimately, connected with the distress of the people, to which I will advert. My Lords, to reduce all unnecessary expense is the firm resolution of myself and my colleagues, maintaining, however, all that is positively required for the support and service of the Government, while we cut off with an unsparing hand all that is not demanded for the interests, the honour, and the welfare of the country. We have, since our appointment to Office, already resolved to cut off some places about which there has been a discussion elsewhere; but do not suppose, that we take credit to ourselves for effecting so trifling a reduction, or that we limit our views to such insignificant reduction. No, my Lords, every part of the Government is open to consideration and revision; and I can assure your Lordships that future reductions shall be made with unflinching severity, and with all the care and diligence which we can apply to the subject. Connected with the question of economy and retrenchment is doubtless that of maintaining the public credit, and on this I will merely observe, that it is at once our interest and our most sacred duty, and it shall be our object, to support public credit by all means in our power. The only other point which it remains for me to touch upon, and on which it may be satisfactory to your Lordships to receive some explanation, is our relations with Foreign Powers, and the line of policy which the present Administration means to pursue. On this, as on the other branches into which I have divided my statement, I must say, that hitherto we have had no means of knowing what has been done upon this subject by any of our predecessors. But, my Lords, I now repeat in office what I before stated as my opinion out of office, that the first object, interest, and duty, of the British Government, ought to be, to maintain peace by all means consistent with the honour of the country. Our true policy is, to maintain universal peace, and therefore non-interference is the princilpe,—the great principle which ought to be and will be heartily adopted by the present administration. I cannot say more, not knowing what has been the course pursued by my predecessors; but in looking to the means by which peace may be preserved, we must also look to the maintenance of our connection with the Powers with whom we are in alliance. It must be the care of the new Government, as I have no doubt it was of the old, to maintain a proper connection with our allies, for the purpose of amicably settling all questions which may be likely to disturb the repose of Europe. Some solicitude may be felt in consequence of the events lately passed in France, but with that country I trust we shall be able to hold the most friendly relations. Between these two great and powerful nations, standing on the same principles of public liberty, and influenced by the same high and honourable motives, and by the same desire to promote each its own prosperity and happiness, I trust the union, arising from community of sentiment and feeling, will be the closest and the most enduring. Their common interest will, I hope, teach them to seek and to promote each the welfare and the happiness of the other, and cautiously to avoid all views of aggrandizement and ambition, which might endanger the stability of both empires, and disturb the peace of the civilized world. These, my Lords, are the views of his Majesty's Government. To sum up in a few words the principles on which I stand, they will, I trust, be found to be these—Amelioration of Abuses—Promotion of the most rigid Economy—and every endeavour to preserve peace consistently with the honour of the country. Under these principles I have undertaken a task, to which I have not the affectation or presumption to state that I am equal. I am arrived at a time of life, my Lords, when retirement and repose are more to be desired than that active and anxious exertion to which I shall be subjected in the high office to which my gracious Sovereign has been pleased to call me. And I can assure your Lordships that I should not have engaged in this arduous task had I not found, and I may be permitted to say thus much without incurring the charge of vanity or arrogance, as it arises from no merits of my own, but rather to accidental circumstances, had I not found that if I did not submit to the will of the Sovereign such an Administration as I could support, and as I thought necessary to the country in its present circumstances could not be formed. My Lords, I remembered my age and my limited capabilities, but I was aware that if I declined the task which had been allotted to me, there was reason to fear the attempt to form a new Administration might have failed altogether. Urged, therefore, my Lords, by considerations of public duty to attempt that to which I am not equal, the government of the country at this momentous crisis, my only trust is in the support of this House and of the public, and above all, in the gracious kindness and confidence of his Majesty, which alone can safely carry me through the difficulties with which I am surrounded. With this support I am ready to attempt all things for the service of the country—looking always to the principles on which I have demanded this support, and claiming now that indulgence which may be well and justly accorded to an Administration formed under such circumstances, and so recently completed. If hereafter it shall be found that I cannot execute what I have undertaken—if I cannot conduct the public affairs in a manner satisfactory to those from whom I claim support—if it be proved that I am unable to bear the load I have essayed to carry, I shall be willing and ready to resign into his Majesty's hands that power which he has so graciously, so kindly, and so confidingly submitted to me, in a manner which displayed at once his love for his country, his earnest desire to promote its prosperity, and his great condescension towards myself. It is not necessary for me to say more than to express my gratitude at the confidence of his most gracious Majesty, which alone enabled me to form an Administration so rapidly and under such peculiar circumstances; for it is only this day week that I was listening on the other side of the House to the speech of the noble and learned Lord lately on the Woolsack, and little did I then suppose that such an event would come to pass, and it is only by the gracious confidence of the Sovereign that I have been, in this short space of time, enabled to assemble around me, with no view to parliamentary influence, with no other view than that of their competency to fill their situations, the friends with whom I act. My Lords, my present task is done, the Administration stands before you and the public. You know the persons who compose it, you have heard the principles on which it professes to act; and for the maintenance of them we throw ourselves upon the confidence and support of our Sovereign, your Lordships, and the country.

The Earl of *Radnor* was understood to declare his conviction, that Parliamentary Reform was not merely expedient, but the only measure which could ensure the salvation of the country. He was certain that if the speech which the noble Marquis had just made on that subject, accompanied as it had been by the commentary of the noble Earl, went forth to the country, it would create in every quarter consternation and dismay. The noble Earl had expressed the dismay which he felt at what he called the fanciful and the extreme plans of reform which were abroad. It was not the first time that he had heard such expressions fall from the noble Earl. He did not quarrel with the noble Earl for using them, but he must lament that the noble Earl, occupying so prominent a situation as he now did in his Majesty's councils, should have dealt in such general declarations, and should have publicly asserted, that it was impossible for Government to pledge itself to any specific plan of reform. If he understood the noble Marquis correctly,—and he was not sure that he did,—the noble Marquis's plan of reform was, to grant the elective franchise to some large towns and to preserve the least defensible part of the present system, the small and decayed boroughs. Now, if the noble Earl, in speaking of his intention to adopt no system of reform which should not pay due respect to the settled institutions of the country, meant, like the noble Marquis to preserve the smaller boroughs, he would repeat his former assertion, that the declaration of these two Ministers would spread consternation and dismay from one end of the kingdom to the other. He could tell them that such a system of reform would be rejected as insufficient by the whole country. He hoped that he had misunderstood the noble Earl, and he hoped he had, for it was his firm conviction that nothing but Parliamentary Reform on a wide basis, a basis much wider than that laid down by the noble Earl, would satisfy the people or save the country. Within a few days expectation has been raised to the highest pitch by the appointment of the present Administration, and he again warned the noble Earl that he would spread dismay and confusion through the country should he not be prepared to propose reform on an extensive scale.

Earl *Grey*: I am surprised at the manner in which the noble Earl has received what I said. I stated, that I think the question of reform should be taken into consideration; and that I had the permission of his Majesty to bring before him, at a proper time, a plan for reforming the representation. What I said was, that looking with apprehension to the wild and fanciful theories which I regretted were too much promulgated—but feeling also that the defects which had been occasioned by time in the representation required correction, my object would be to propose—if the happy medium can be found—such a reform as would in this respect satisfy the public expectation, without endangering—here was the limit, and the only limit—by sudden change and violent disturbance, the settled institutions of the country. Does my noble friend mean to say, that a reform which rests on that principle will be at once rejected by the country? If so, I tell him that those who would thus reject it expect revolution and not reform. My great object is, the desire of preventing that which, be it needed as it may, must always be the greatest of all possible political evils. The principle of my reform is, to prevent the necessity for revolution. And I must say, I do not think it fair of my noble friend to look for a declaration less limited, or to wish for details. I trust the House will be satisfied with the principle and the limit I lay down, which seems to have been so much misunderstood by the noble Earl. When did he find that I limited the reform to giving Representatives to the large towns? The principle on which I mean to act is neither more nor less than that of reforming to preserve, and not to overthrow.

The Marquis of *Lansdown* also defended himself from having limited the proposed Reform to giving Representatives to the large towns. He was convinced that he consulted the public interests by abstaining altogether from entering into a detailed statement on the subject of reform till the intended measure of his Majesty's Ministers was ripened and sufficiently matured to be submitted as a perfect whole to the consideration of Parliament. At the proper period, he said, he should be prepared to show, that the great object he and his colleagues had in view was, to preserve, while they improved, the Representation of the people in Parliament.

The Earl of *Radnor* would not have uttered one word of detail on the subject of reform, had not the noble Earl and the noble Marquis who had just spoken, themselves led the way, by a statement of their views on that most important subject. The noble Marquis, for example, had intimated the intention of Ministers to propose a plan for enfranchising the large towns [" *No, no.*"]. With their leave, he might not have used these exact words, but the import was to that effect. If the noble Lords had themselves preserved the discreet silence which they recommended to him, he would not have then taken it upon him to utter a word on the subject.

Lord *Wharncliffe* had listened to the statement of the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Ministers with his best attention, and, he was happy to say, with satisfaction. The question of Reform of Parliament had now made such progress, that the door could not be any longer shut against it, and the question was, what were they to do, what plan of reform was it most expedient to adopt? The answer of the noble Earl, that he should take care, in effecting a reform of the representation of the people, to inviolably preserve the monarchy, and the established institutions of the country, was one which he could not but approve of, and which, therefore, would make him willing to give the noble Earl his support when his measure was before their Lordships. He also, and so he was sure did every noble Lord who had heard him, approved of the views of the noble Earl respecting the foreign relations of the country—that every effort, compatible with the honour and character of the country, would be made to preserve peace; for he could assure him, that there was no one point on which the honest and sound portion of the community was more earnest than that we should, as much as possible, consistently with the permanent interests of the country, avoid unnecessary warlike interference with foreign States.

He also was disposed to support the noble Earl's plan for retrenchment, so far as was compatible with the integrity of existing establishments. The noble Earl would, he hoped, excuse him if he took advantage of that first occasion of suggesting to him the policy and true wisdom of avoiding the error into which the party of which the noble Earl had been usually considered the head, had of late years too often exhibited a tendency to fall,—he meant that of being led too much by mere popular applause. He had the highest opinion of the noble Earl's firmness and consistency, but still he could not avoid assuring him, that if in his measures he permitted himself to be led astray by any *ignis fatuus* of popularity, he would most certainly be deceived, for the light would only lead him and his party to destruction. The people were now persuaded that the most extravagant benefits would result from reform; but if it were granted to-morrow in the largest sense it would not relieve their distress. He hoped, therefore, that the new Administration would not foster these unfounded expectations. He trusted, indeed, that he should be enabled to give the noble Earl his best and cordial support for the general tendency of his measures; and that, in watching those measures with becoming vigilance, he should never be provoked into unnecessary opposition.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* could not but regret that Ministers had given notice of a most important measure, on a subject in which the public felt a deep interest, without being at the same time prepared to enter into a detailed statement of the scope and object of their plan, as great inconvenience, and, he feared, great misconception would be the consequence. The whole of the intentions of the noble Earl on this important subject could be gathered only by vague surmise, and he feared that each heated imagination would put its own interpretation on his words. He was as disconnected with the new as with the late Administration, and should be determined in his votes by the character and tendency of the measures proposed, apart from other considerations. Their Lordships could not now delay or postpone taking the question of reform into consideration, and a tremendous question it was, without apprehending the most fearful consequences. He thought, and he always had thought some measure of reform necessary, and that the recent declaration of a noble Duke against all reform was the cause of much of the present discontent of the public mind. But while he was prepared to support such a measure as would improve and remedy the present system of representation of Members of the other House of Parliament, without endangering the established institutions of the country, he felt himself bound to declare, that those who considered that withholding that reform was the cause of—or granting it the remedy for—the distress under which the labouring classes in many districts then laboured, not only were deceiving themselves, but would, by deceiving and disappointing the country, add greatly to the distress and discontent of the public. He was willing to urge this point, the rather, as he feared the reaction, which the impression he was endeavouring to counteract would create among those now labouring under distress, would only tend to work up the discontented into a climax of dissatisfaction with the measures of the Government, for which it might not be easy to devise an efficient remedy. He was far from wishing the noble Earl to delay his plan of reform; he would urge him, indeed, if he had any regard to his own safety, and to the safety of the country, to bring it forward as soon as possible; but, at the same time, he would warn him, that if he thought by any measure of reform to still the popular clamour, and diminish the public distress, he would but aggravate the evils. The distress, the difficulties of the industrious classes, must be got rid off before quiet could be restored. The distress, therefore, for which reform will afford no remedy, must be first taken into consideration, and he trusted that the question of inquiry into the causes of the distress which prevailed unhappily in so many districts of the country would not be left to any individual Member of either House, but would be taken up by the Government in its aggregate and responsible character. These causes were too deep-seated to be properly sifted and remedied by any plan or measure not emanating from Ministers, and therefore should at once occupy their most serious attention. He would not then endeavour to explain his own views of the origin of that distress, particularly as it applied to the agricultural districts, further than to observe, that it lay chiefly in the altered relations between the farmer and his labourer, which had been in progress for the last fourteen or fifteen years, under which the agricultural labourer no longer possessed that occupancy or tenure in the land which would afford him a sufficient sustenance without being compelled to have recourse to the poor-rates for a portion of his wages—a system which, by depriving him of all stake or interest in the land he would have occupied under a better state of things, made him a ready prey to discontent, and a ready listener to violent means of amending his condition, —a system which, in fact, by making the agricultural labourer dependent for the payment of his hardly-earned wages on poor-rates, miserably and churlishly doled out, had rendered the condition of the poor of the country more abject than that of the poor of any other nation, and, as a consequence, had made them more dissatisfied with existing institutions. Within his own recollection the payment of the wages of labour out of the poor-rates was a thing hardly known, and every agricultural labourer had his own cottage and a small portion of soil to cultivate for the use of his family. Now the system prevailed in whole counties, and it was not unusual to see four or five wretched labourers huddled together in one miserable hut. For their misery some remedy must be found. Within the last few years the capital of the farmers had been almost annihilated and they were no longer able to feed and employ their labourers. Some remedy must be found for this growing evil, or assuredly such calamities would intervene as the country had seldom seen. The whole system required amendment, and he trusted would not be neglected by Ministers, as it was much more intimately connected with the distress of the country, than, as might readily be supposed, the more splendid question of reform. He trusted that the whole subject of the distressed condition of the working classes would be taken up by the new Government, and not be left to any individual not in Office; the rather, as a measure for amending the poor-rates must emanate from the other House, as coming under the head of a money-bill; and as holding out an expectation of relief to that distress by means of a reform of the representation would only be followed by mischievous disappointment to all parties.

Earl *Grey* thought that the advocates of the most extensive and extravagant measure of reform would have paid the new Government the civility of waiting till their measures were submitted to their Lordships' consideration, before they called for a detailed statement of the provisions of those measures, or pronounced that their effect upon the country would be neither more nor less than consternation and dismay. Without then entering into a detail—which he was sure would be best brought forward on a future occasion—of his plan of reform, he would observe, that the noble Earl's remarks were, he must say, unnecessary, and, it should seem, founded on a misconception. He had not in any part of his speech connected the necessity of a reform with the distress under which the working classes in certain districts then laboured. He did not propose as the remedy for that distress a reform of the representation; still less was it to be inferred from what he had said, that the people of England did not labour under other grievances which called for redress. On the contrary, he stated, in the most explicit terms he could make use of, that the very first subject to which the King's new Government would have to bestow their most serious attention was, above all others, the distressed condition of the working classes. He repeated, to that condition would be devoted their most serious deliberations from that very night, on which, as he had already stated, a Council was to be held, with a view to consider the subject and remedy; and that that inquiry having been instituted, and some measures adopted, Ministers would next apply themselves to the important subject of Reform in Parliament.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* begged the noble Earl to understand, that his remarks were not meant to apply to his speech, but to what had fallen on the subject of distress and reform from a noble Earl (Radnor) near him.

The Petition laid on the Table.

The Marquis of Lansdown presented a similar Petition from Cupar. Laid on the Table.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, Nov. 22.

MINUTES.] The Administration of Justice Amendment Bill was, on the Motion of Sir J. SCARLETT, read a third time and passed.

Mr. SEVERN brought in a Bill to amend the Stage Coach Regulation Acts.

Leave of absence was given to several Members, on account of the disturbed state of the Districts in which they reside.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. SPENCE, of all sums of Money received in each year, during the last four years, by each of the Registrars and Deputy Registrars of the High Court of Chancery, and by each of their Clerks, and of the several matters on account of which the same have been received; distinguishing particularly how much of such sums has been received for Decrees and Orders made by the Lord Chancellor which were not of course, and how much for Orders of course, how much for Decrees and Orders made by the Master of the Rolls, which were not of course, and how much for Orders of course, and how much for Decrees and Orders made by the Vice-Chancellor, which were not of course, and how much for Orders of course, how much of such sums has been received for Copies of Decrees and Orders, how much for Minutes of Decrees and Orders respectively, and how much of the money received for Copies of Decrees and Orders has been received from, or on account of, the persons on whose behalf the Decrees or Orders were drawn up; and stating the largest and also the lowest sum of money which has been received in each year by each of the Registrars or Deputy Registrars, or by their respective Clerks, for any one Decree or Order, and for the Copy of any one Decree or Order; and how much of such several sums were applied for the use or benefit of each of the Registrars or Deputy Registrars, and how much for each of their Clerks, and whether any and which of the said sums, and to what amount annually have been received as gifts, or gratuities, or for expedition, and by whom by name the same have been received:" "Of all the sums of Money received in each year during the last four years, for passing and entering Decrees and Orders, and by whom by name, and for whose use and benefit the same have been received and applied:" "Of all sums of Money received in each year during the last four years, by the Master of the Report Office, or by the Clerks or any other persons in the Report Office, and of the several matters in respect of which they have been received; distinguishing particularly how much of such sums has been received for filing Reports and Certificates, how much for Searches, how much for Copies, and how much, if any thing, for gifts or gratuities, or for expedition, and by whom by name, and for whose use and benefit the same have been respectively received."

New Writs were ordered to be issued, on the Motion of Mr. S. RICE, for the County of Northampton, in the room of Lord ALTHORP, who had accepted the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer:—For the County of Cumberland, in the room of Sir J. R. G. GRAHAM, who had accepted the office of First Lord of the Admiralty:—For Cambridge University, in the room of Viscount PALMERSTON, appointed one of his Majesty's principal Secretaries of State:—For Preston, in the room of E. G. STANLEY, Esq. appointed Chief Secretary for Ireland:—For Inverness, in the room of the right hon. C. GRANT, appointed President of the Board of Control:—For Aylesbury, in the room of Lord NUGENT, appointed a Commissioner of the Treasury:—For Tralee, in the room of R. V. SMITH, esq., appointed a Commissioner of the Treasury:—For Portsmouth, in the room of F. BARING, esq., appointed a Commissioner of the Treasury:—For Youghall, in the room of the hon. G. PONSONBY, appointed a Commissioner of the Treasury:—For Dover, in the room of C. P. THOMSON, esq., appointed Vice-President of the Board of Trade:—For Oakhampton, in the room of the hon. W. A. ELLIS, appointed First Commissioner of Woods and Forests.

Petitions presented. For the abolition of Negro Slavery, by Sir F. BLAKE, from Berwick-upon-Tweed:—By Mr. DUGDALE, from Rugby:—By Mr. LITTLETON, six from Staffordshire:—By Lord MAITLAND, from Jedburgh:—By Sir R. PHILLIPS, three from Haverfordwest, and three from the County of Pembroke:—By Lord J. STUART, two from Meath:—By Mr. KNIGHT, from Warrington:—By Lord STANLEY, from Oldham, and other places, in Lancashire:—By Mr. SANDFORD, from Wilverton:—By Sir W. INGILBY, from Gainsborough:—By Mr. PATTEN, from Garstang:—By Mr. BELL, from Wall's End, and other places in Northumberland:—By Mr. O'HARA, from a parish in Galway:—By Lord MORPETH, from Bradford, and several other places in Yorkshire:—By Mr. C. W. WYNN, from a place in Wales:—By Mr. PRINGLE, from the County of Selkirk:—By Sir J. SCARLETT, from Malton, and from New Malton, Yorkshire:—By Lord WM. RUSSELL, from Gloucestershire:—By Lord BELGRAVE, from Chester and Stockport:—By Mr. PONSONBY, from Wimborne Minster:—By Mr. WILKS, several from Dissenting Congregations:—By Sir M. W. RIDLEY, from Newcastle-upon-Tyne:—By Sir R. PRICE, from Bromyard:—By Mr. GISBORNE, from Chapel-le-Frith:—By Mr. EVANS, from the Methodist Chapel of St. John's, Bedford-row; and two from Dissenting Chapels in Derby:—By Sir R. PEEL, four from Mesham and other places in Derbyshire. By Lord MORPETH, from a Parish in Galway, praying that the Catholic Inhabitants of the Town of Galway might be placed on the same footing with regard to the Elective Franchise as their Protestant fellow townsmen:—By Mr. C. W. WYNN, a similar Petition, from the Parish of St. Nicholas, in the Town of Galway. By Sir W. INGILBY, from the Inhabitants resident in the neighbourhood of Horncastle, praying for a repeal of the Assessed Taxes. For a Repeal of the Union, by Mr. O'CONNELL, from the journeymen Butchers of Dublin; and from the Parishes of Ardcath, (county Meath), and Kilross, (county Sligo):—By Mr. WYSE, from Tipperary. By Mr. DUGDALE, from the Chamber of Commerce at Birmingham, claiming Compensation for Loss of Property at Copenhagen in 1807. Against the Duty on Sea-borne Coals, by Lord F. OSBORNE, from Wisbeach and the Isle of Ely:—By Mr. WYSE, from St. Nicholas, Dublin. By Mr. HOBHOUSE, from the Inhabitants of South Shields, complaining of the abuses in the Church Establishment, and praying for a Reform of them. By the same hon. Member, from the Inhabitant Householders of the Parish of St. Clement Danes, complaining of the expense of the New Police; also praying for a repeal of the House and Window Tax.

DR. PHILLPOTTS.] Mr. Spring Rice moved that a New Writ be issued for the election of a Member for the County of Cumberland, in the room of Sir James Graham, who had accepted the Office of First Lord Commissioner of the Admiralty.

Mr. *Phillpotts*, on the question being put, said, that a motion respecting the living of Stanhope had been put upon the books by the hon. Member who had now vacated his seat, and as that Motion could not now come on, for a short time at least, and, in the mean time, the right rev. Prelate referred to in that Motion, was subjected to the effect of those mistakes that had been circulated respecting him, he (Mr. Phillpotts) trusted that the House would indulge him while he made a short statement of the real circumstances of the case:—The Petition from the inhabitants of Stanhope to his Majesty, praying that the Rectory of that Parish might not be holden *in commendam* with the See of Exeter, contained three allegations—and only three of any moment. They were as follows:—1st. That "the population of which the Rector has the spiritual care, consists of 12,000 inhabitants."—2nd. That "he delegates the spiritual care of these 12,000 souls to a hireling."—3rd. That "the parish pays him a tithe of 4,000*l.* a-year, and therefore may claim the advantages of a resident Rector." Every one of these allegations was substantially untrue. First, it was alleged that the population consisted of 12,000; whereas, at the last census, under the most extended description which could be given to the district, the numbers were no more than 7,341. But of these 7,341, the far greater part, no less than 4,994, were not placed under the spiritual care of the Rector. They belonged to an ancient Chapelry, locally situate indeed within the limits of the parish of Stanhope, but placed from the earliest times under a distinct minister, with a distinct endowment; and for many years past an entirely independent benefice. Within that Chapelry a second independent benefice had recently been erected. Over the incumbents of these two benefices, which, were indeed, in his patronage, he had no control whatever. In short, instead of 12,000 souls, as was asserted in the petition, 2,341 only were under the spiritual care of the Rector of Stanhope. The second allegation of the petition was, that the Rector "delegates the spiritual care of 12,000 inhabitants to a hireling." It had just been shown that the care of 2,341 only could be delegated by him at all. It was delegated, during the time of his necessary absence, to two resident Curates, both of whom were men of education and high character; one of them a man of independent fortune, who had resigned a small living of which he was incumbent, in order to become Curate at Stanhope. These Curates were not dependents; for when they were licensed, as they were bound to be, they were irremoveable, except for some fault of which the Bishop was the judge; and from his sentence they had an appeal to the Metropolitan. In short, therefore, instead of "the spiritual care of 12,000 inhabitants being delegated to one hireling," as was asserted in the petition, the truth was, that 2,347 are placed, during the absence of the Rector, under the charge of two licensed and responsible Curates. The third allegation was, that "the parish pays to the Rector a tithe of 4,000*l.* per annum, and therefore has a right to the advantages of a resident Rector;" whereas, in truth, the whole amount of what was paid to him by the parishioners was something between 500*l.* and 600*l.* per annum, hardly a shilling in the pound on the rental. The great bulk of the emoluments of the living arose from a payment not made by any inhabitants of the parish of Stanhope, nor by persons who could in any sense be called parishioners It was, in effect, an ancient donation from the See of Durham, made long before the restraining Statutes prohibited such an alienation of its funds. That donation conferred on the Rector of Stanhope a portion, nominally a tenth, of the ore raised from the lead mines of the See situate within the parish, which portion, amounting in value at present to about 3,000*l.* per annum, was paid by the Lessees of the Bishop's mines, who lived at a great distance from Stanhope. There were other considerable mines within the parish, especially those of the chairman of the meeting at which the petition was voted, but neither he nor any other proprietor, except the Bishop, paid anything whatever to the Rector on account of his mines. That payment, therefore, being the bulk of the income of the living of Stanhope, was taken from the revenues of the See of Durham; and that opulent See, so often as the Rectory of Stanhope was holden *in commendam*, contributes to supply the defective endowment of some poorer Bishoprick; an appropriation so fitting, that this Rectory has repeatedly been made the subject of a *commendam*. The three Rectors in succession who immediately preceded the last incumbent, held that living with their respective Bishopricks. 1st, Bishop Butler, the author of the Analogy —a man not more distinguished by his wonderful talents than by his pious and conscientious discharge of all his duties—with the See of Bristol. 2nd, Bishop Keene, with the See of Chester. 3rd, Bishop Thurlow, with the See of Lincoln. The See of Exeter, in consequence of the spoliation of its revenues, in the reigns of Edward 6th and Queen Elizabeth, was notoriously too poor for the maintenance of its Bishop. It had been the invariable practice to allow those who were raised to it to retain some or all of their former preferments. Since the commencement of the present century, there had been three instances of Bishops of this See holding livings; one of them, Bishop Courtenay, was Rector of the rich and populous parish of St. George's Hanover-square, containing 43,936 inhabitants (though of this instance it was freely admitted, that the parish, being situate in London, might be superintended by the Bishop, during the months in which he attended in Parliament). 2nd, Bishop Pelham held a parish in Sussex of 1,907 inhabitants. 3rd, The late Bishop held a parish in Yorkshire, containing 841 inhabitants, the income of which, being small, was found not sufficient to make the revenues of the See of Exeter adequate to the demands upon him, though he was a single man. It must be observed, that when a poor Bishoprick was to be sustained by a *commendam*, the question, what that *commendam* should be, must be decided, generally, by the nature of the preferment previously held by the person nominated to the Bishoprick. In the present instance, besides this general reason, there were special circumstances of a very peculiar kind. When the present Rector of Stanhope succeeded to the living, he built a house upon it, at the requisition of the late Bishop of Durham, the patron of the living, and on a plan approved and settled by him. The charge of building that house and the premises annexed to it, together with a house, which, of his own accord, and without being required by the Bishop, he built for the residence of his Curates, has amounted to 12,000*l.*; which charge, equivalent to 1,000*l.* per annum, was not laid permanently on the living, but attaches solely to himself, and, of course would continue so to attach, even if he should cease to be Rector. In consequence, when his Majesty's gracious intention of raising him to the bench of Bishops was announced to him, four months ago, not having solicited, nor taken any step, direct or indirect, to obtain this or any other Bishoprick, he immediately felt it his duty to state the impossibility of his availing himself of his Majesty's gracious purpose, unless, like his predecessors, he should be permitted to retain his living *in commendam*, there being no other preferment vacant at the disposal of the Crown approaching to an equivalent for the sacrifice. It was after this communication that he was informed by his Majesty's Minister, that orders were given for preparing the proper instruments to enable him to retain the living; he, in consequence, no longer scrupled to accept the offered promotion. He trusted that this statement would be thought satisfactory, to the hon. Baronet and the country and that the House would hear no more upon the subject. He was quite sure that the hon. Baronet had no notion when he gave notice of the motion, of what were the real circumstances of the case.

Sir *H. Hardinge* said, that as the circumstances attendant upon the promotion of Dr. Phillpotts were generally understood, he felt it necessary to say a few words upon the subject. He had the authority of the Duke of Wellington for stating, that he (the Duke of Wellington) was in communication with Dr. Phillpotts upon the subject of the Catholic Relief Bill, and that Dr. Phillpotts, instead of being, as was generally supposed, an approver of that measure, had been, in fact, an opponent of the measure, up to the time of the passing of it. He could further state, on the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury, that it was the intention of Lord Liverpool to raise Dr. Phillpotts to the Episcopal Bench. The House should also, perhaps, be informed, that the Duke of Wellington made the usual communications to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, and that the noble Duke received the assent of those right reverend Prelates to the propriety of the appointment of Dr. Phillpotts to the See of Exeter. The right reverend Prelates had, indeed, said, that the appointment might be unpopular in the Church; but, as the noble Duke knew that the grounds on which Dr. Phillpotts was unpopular were altogether mistaken and erroneous, the noble Duke saw, that this could be no objection to the appointment. Let him observe that Dr. Phillpotts had fourteen children to provide for, and that he was compelled to lay aside a considerable portion of his income as a provision for his family, in the event of any accident happening to him. He did not appeal *ad misericordiam* in behalf of Dr. Phillpotts. They ought to recollect that Dr. Phillpotts had laid out 12,000*l.* on the living, and that he had all along been promised that he should hold the living *in commendam* with the See of Exeter. He had thought it his duty to state this to the House, in addition to the explanation which had been given by the hon. Member opposite, of the misrepresentations which had gone abroad on this subject.

THE LATE AND THE NEW MINISTRY.] Mr. *O'Connell*, seized the same opportunity to express his hope that the office of Treasurer for Ireland, a sinecure, would be abolished. This was the more necessary, as the country was paying 16,000*l.* a-year as pensions to retired or displaced Lord Chancellors, and might soon have an additional 8,000*l.* to pay.

Mr. *J. Wood* would take that opportunity to say, that though no individual could differ more than he did upon many public questions with the members of his Majesty's late Administration, he regretted, upon other grounds, that some of them had been obliged to quit office. Though no ministry ever came into power in times of greater difficulty than those which marked the accession of the present Ministry, he rejoiced exceedingly that the principles which they professed had triumphed and he did not sit there to oppose them, [*the hon. Member occupied his usual seat on the Opposition Benches*,] but he sat there, because it was his opinion that, in the present corrupt state of the Representation it was the duty of every independent Member of Parliament to exercise a vigilance, almost amounting to a suspicion, towards any Administration. Though he differed upon many general public grounds from the right hon. Gentleman, the late Secretary for the Home Department, he conceived that the country was indebted to him for many useful reforms; and he regretted much that that right hon. Gentleman had felt it his duty to retire from office. He was sorry that the right hon. Gentleman had not become convinced of the necessity of reform; but, at the same time, he trusted, though out of office, that the country would feel grateful to the right hon. Baronet for what he had effected. He also regretted the retirement of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Ireland, than whom no one could be found better calculated for the discharge of the public duties which had devolved upon him; and he likewise regretted the retirement of the noble Lord who had presided over the Woods and Forests, the duties of which office would never be discharged in a more vigilant excellent, and honourable manner. While he said all this, he was far from wishing to be understood as giving his praise or assent to the general public principles which had rendered the retirement of the late Ministers necessary, in order to satisfy the country. He repeated, that he thought these were times of great difficulty in which the new Ministry had come into power; but never was a more glorious opportunity presented to any Ministry than was offered to them, and never did the country place more confidence in a Ministry who came into office upon the sole foundation of reform and retrenchment. The new Ministers were pledged to reform and retrenchment, and to the principle of non-interference with foreign Powers, and if they but did their duty, they might be sure that the country would support them. If that House should not support them in carrying into effect those measures to which they were pledged, then let them dissolve Parliament, and make their appeal to the country. Constituted as that House was, the Treasury could always return from twenty to thirty Members, and if the new Ministers should be driven to a dissolution, they could at once command that number of supporters from the Government boroughs, and he would assure them that all popular places would send Representatives to that House to support them.

Sir *Joseph Yorke* (who spoke from his usual place upon the Ministerial benches) said, he was also anxious to make a declaration of his sentiments upon this occasion, as well as the hon. member for Preston. If the new Ministers would conduct themselves properly—if they would redeem the pledges which they had given—and if, beginning at the right end, they would effect the retrenchment and the Reform which they promised, they should have his support. He hoped, among other things, that the new Ministry would again bring forward the question for the abolition of the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland, which ought to be done away. The greatest mistake of all had been the declaration against Reform. Had the franchises of a few of the corrupt boroughs been given to the large towns, even by way of a sop to Cerberus, the Ministers might have weathered the storm, and he for one regretted that they had not done so.

Mr. *Pringle* expressed his dissent from the gallant Admiral's opinion as to the office of Lord Lieutenant for Ireland.

Writ ordered.

MARY-LE-BONE SELECT VESTRY.] Mr. *Hume* said, he held in his hand a Petition from a Parish which now contained 130,000 inhabitants. He alluded to the parish of Mary-le-bone, and the petitioners prayed for a law to enable them to remove the Select Vestry, which now concealed from the parishioners the nature of their expenditure, and which had been made to amount to so large a sum as greatly to distress the parish. When the parishioners had come before the Magistrates to appeal against the conduct of the Vestry, they found many of the Officers of the Vestry sitting on the bench with the Magistrates, and they complained against the proceeding as altogether unfair. The petitioners prayed that the Select Vestry should be abolished, and that every individual paying a direct tax should have a vote in the election of Vestrymen. For his part he hoped that the time had now come for doing away the Select Vestry system altogether.

Mr. *Wilks* thought, that the parishioners had an advantage in preliminary appeals, and might afterwards appeal to the Sessions, while other parishes could only appeal to the general Sessions.

The Petition ordered to be printed.

REFORM OF PARLIAMENT.] Mr. *Denman* rose to present a Petition from the Town of Nottingham, praying for a thorough Reform of Parliament. The petition was signed by 8,000 persons, a number which constituted more than half of the adult male population of the place. The petitioners prayed that the subject of Reform might be taken immediately into the consideration of the House, and they expressed themselves favourable to the vote by Ballot. They were convinced that the mere extension of the franchise to a few great towns would be a Reform of very little value. With respect to the vote by ballot, he thought the subject required the fullest consideration, since so very large a portion of the country was favourable to that system. In his private opinion, he was by no means convinced of its propriety by any arguments he had as yet heard, though he must confess himself quite open to conviction upon the subject.

Sir *R. Ferguson* supported the petition, and he hoped that the time was arrived when the prayers of the people would be heard in that House, and he trusted that before many weeks the Cabinet would bring in some measures for Reform. As to the vote by ballot, he had been rather opposed to it, but the manner in which the late elections had been conducted, had convented him to take a favourable view of that plan. At any rate it seemed now to be desired by the people, and their wishes ought to be attended to.

Mr. *O'Connell* believed, that the people of Ireland generally; and more especially in the north, and in Armagh, were unanimously in favour of voting by Ballot.

SUSSEX SPECIAL JURY BILL.] Mr. Curteis moved the third reading of the Sussex Special Jury Bill.

Mr. *Campbell* said, that he continued of opinion, that the measure was of an injurious character, and that it would tend to prevent a fair and impartial administration of justice. The Bill proceeded altogether upon a false assumption of the law with respect to where the Assizes were held, the places not being permanently fixed by law, but changeable at the pleasure of the Crown. He did not know what could be done in cases of remanets, if the Bill were to pass. In this respect the Bill was, in fact, opposed to what it pretended to accomplish; for as the Assizes were held alternately in the eastern and western parts of the county, and as the remanets from one Assize were tried at the next, the Special Jurors who had been summoned in such causes in the first instance from one division of the county, would have to attend the trial in the other. He thought the general system ought not to be broken in upon by any such local Bills.

Mr. *O'Connell* thought, that as the learned Member's objections were technical, they ought to have been stated in the Committee. The cases of remanets were provided for in the Bill.

Mr. *Curteis* had no wish whatever to exclude petty Jurymen from any advantages to be given to especial Jurymen under the Bill. It should be remembered that the county of Sussex was 100 miles long, and only thirty broad, and it was a great hardship to call upon Jurymen to travel such a vast distance. The Bill had been brought in with the approbation and at the desire of a very considerable body of the freeholders of the county. The districts for selecting Juries would be fifty miles long, by thirty broad, and it was not likely that Juries could be packed. He had seen an observation in another place than that House, that Special Jurymen were paid for their trouble, and consequently that it was not necessary to consult their convenience so much as that of petty Jurors; but the payment was only one guinea, and which was unworthy of consideration with respect to the distance they had to travel. If the districts into which the Bill would divide the county were too small for the fair selection of Juries, what must be the case in Rutlandshire, Huntingdon, and Hertfordshire? and yet no complaints of partiality in the selection of Juries were made in those small counties. There was a special clause in the Bill, providing for remanets.

Sir *R. Peel* thought the House under great obligations to the hon. member for Stafford (Mr. Campbell) for his observations upon the Bill, which certainly formed a precedent for circumscribing the districts from which Juries were selected, and therefore the Bill trenched upon the principles of the Jury Act. Practically speaking, Sussex was divided into two parts—the eastern and western, and they were separated more than parts of counties generally were. Upon the whole, he thought the local convenience of the county would be very much consulted by the Act, and he, for one, should not be disposed to offer it any opposition.

Lord *George Cavendish* wished for a postponement of the measure, to facilitate the arrangement of its details.

Sir *James Scarlett* did not wish to obstruct the Bill, if the gentlemen of the county, who must be the best judges of the matter, were favourable to it; but the question was, whether the distance from which Special Jurors must be summoned was such as to render it worth while to pass a law on the subject.

Mr. *Denman* thought the Bill calculated to afford a reasonable degree of accommodation to the county, and anticipated no greater inconvenience in Sussex, when thus divided, than in other large divisions of counties, provided a sufficient fund of Special Jurors could be found within it. He thought, however, that the part of the Bill relating to remanets required further consideration, and therefore he hoped that the Bill would be postponed.

Mr. Curteis postponed the third reading till the 1st of February.

Reduction of Official Salaries—New Ministry.] Mr. *Hume* said, he had given notice of a Motion for that evening, to the effect, that it was the opinion of the House that no person appointed to any Office after this time, should receive any Salary or Allowances exceeding those paid for the same Office in 1796, and he felt sure that the House would have gone along with him in the propriety of the Resolution, if it had not been for some circumstances that recently occurred. Now, however, lest it should appear as if such a motion involved a want of confidence in the new Ministers, and as he felt no disposition to refuse his confidence to them at present, he should postpone the Resolution till he saw the House filled with the members of the new Administration, for whom writs had been moved. He would then bring forward his motion, and take the sense of the House upon it, should it be opposed. Meanwhile he took this opportunity to say, that he viewed the recent change with feelings of great satisfaction, because he thought it offered to the country hopes of a radical change in public measures. He understood that Ministers stood pledged to Reform, and as a friend of Reform he was anxious to see them in their places. He also understood that they were pledged to carry into effect measures of economy and retrenchment—principles which he had long advocated. He hoped that Ministers would carry forward such measures in a manner more effectual than their predecessors; if not, they should find him their steady opponent, as he had been the opponent of the last Administration. Under all the circumstances of the case, he thought he should not compromise the duty which he owed to his constituents and the country, by giving the new Administration a fair trial. He had heard with satisfaction that Ministers were disposed to act upon the principles of Free Trade—he hoped and trusted that they would do so, and also adopt measures of liberal policy generally, calculated to satisfy the country. He trusted that they would adopt other measures of Reform, to which, however, it was not now necessary to allude. He hoped that Ministers would imitate their predecessors (whom he must compliment on this point) in upholding public credit. If a doubt were cast for a single moment upon its being maintained, the results must be most disastrous—Ministers owed it, therefore, not only to the safety of this country, but also to the well-being of Europe, to uphold public credit. On the whole, looking to the principles of the men who had now taken office, he thought them entitled to support; and he should withdraw his motion, without fixing any day for bringing it before the House. He had also upon the paper a notice of motion respecting the names, offices, and salaries of the servants of the Ordnance freemen of Queenborough, but he found that the case was already before a committee, and further, that it was thought his Motion might interfere with the proceedings of the Committee. He was the last person to wish to interfere with the justice of that or any other case, and lest he should be thought to compromise the rights of parties before the Committee, he begged to postpone the Motion. There was a question which he confessed he felt rather unwilling to bring before the House—it was involved in the petition of an individual with respect to the Armagh election, praying for an extension of the time allowed for entering into recognizances. The petitioner asked for thirty days, because the Master in Chancery had fixed an irregular day for entering into recognizance; but on inquiry from the Master, he (Mr. Hume) learned, that the day had been fixed at the petitioner's own request. Nevertheless, the petitioner now demanded indulgence on the ground of an irregularity created at his own instance. Under such circumstances, although he did not like to refuse presenting a petition which was properly worded, he could not give his support to its prayer, but would leave it to the House to deal with it as might be thought proper.

The *Speaker* said, that the original petition to which the hon. Member referred, was reported by him to-day to the effect that no recognizance had been entered into; and on that report being made, the order for the consideration of the petition was discharged. With regard to the merits of the case, he believed them to be precisely as the hon. Member had stated. In the first instance, a day was fixed for entering into recognizances on the petitioner's own suggestion; and now further time was asked for, because the Master, acting on that suggestion, had fixed an improper day. It was for the House to say whether, under such circumstances, it felt disposed to receive this petition, or disturb the decision to which it had come upon the subject [*cries of* "*Withdraw.*"]

Mr. *Hume* said, he should yield to the feeling of the House and withdraw the petition.

PUBLIC DISTURBANCES — BALLOTS FOR ELECTION COMMITTEES.] Colonel Cradock having moved for leave of absence for Mr. Dundas, who was ordered to join his regiment in consequence of the public disturbances,

Colonel *Davies* said, this was the second or third leave of absence that had been moved for in consequence of the disturbances which unfortunately existed in various parts of the country. He put it to the good sense of the House to say, whether, under all the circumstances of the case, it might not be expedient to defer a great number of the Election Committees till after Christmas. [*Cries of* "*No.*"] The consequence of the absence of so many Members in the disturbed counties must be, that they should not be able to make a House upon ballot nights, and then the trial of certain election petitions would be adjourned, with great expense and inconvenience to all parties concerned. He therefore put it to his Majesty's Government, whether a compliance with the suggestion which he had thrown out was not desirable.

Mr. *S. Rice* said, that after the decision of the House the other night, postponement could not be thought of. At the same time he admitted that much inconvenience might be felt by parties in the event of difficulty being experienced in obtaining sufficient Members for ballots. But when the difficulty arose, the House must endeavour to deal with it. The hon. Member intimated that it was proposed to get through the ballots for election petitions as fast as possible, and with that view the House, which would adjourn over from to-morrow till Wednesday, would meet again on Thursday, for which day there were three ballots fixed.

Mr. *Hume* hoped no serious idea of postponing the Election Committees was entertained in any quarter. He should certainly oppose such a proposition.

Mr. *R. Colborne* suggested, that between that time and to-morrow an opportunity might be afforded to apply to the parties interested, and consult them as to whether it would be of advantage to them to have their election petitions postponed. If ballots were fixed, and a House was not made upon the appointed day, it would occasion a heavy expense to individuals.

Mr. *Baring* said, he did not wish to disturb what had been done the other night, but at the same time he felt that no duty was so important as that of endeavouring to restore tranquillity and quiet to the country. He might, perhaps, be considered an alarmist—a character he should be sorry to sustain, but he found it impossible to conceal his opinion as to the extent of the existing evil, and wished to call the attention, not only of individuals locally interested, but of Government, to the subject. He repeated he should be sorry to spread any unnecessary alarm, but must declare his opinion that nothing was so pressing—no duty of Government or individuals so urgent—as to endeavour to put an end to the state of things existing in several counties. The authors of those disorders, he thought, might have been, and still might be, discovered, and the disturbances put an end to, by vigilance and promptitude. He wished for no delay in the ballots on election petitions—that was, he desired no delay that could be safely avoided, but, at the same time, he thought it might be well worth while to incur delay in such matters, if by postponement could be purchased the great object of quieting the country. If putting off election committees, or even an adjournment of the House, would leave Gentlemen at liberty to contribute more efficiently to the attainment of that end, no inconvenience that might be caused to individuals should prevent him from recommending the proceeding.

Sir *R. Peel* in reference to the hon. Member's allusion to, and implied want of vigilance and promptitude in the late Cabinet, with respect to the disturbances existing in some parts of the country, could only say, that every aid which it was possible for the counties in question to receive from the military force at the disposal of Government, they had received; that every suggestion of the local magistracy—every suggestion calculated to stop the evil, had been adopted by the late Government, which paid the most undivided attention to the case. Where parties locally interested co-operated with Government—where the disposition towards disturbance had been promptly met by them—it was always suppressed. He had seen individuals, unsupported by any force, refuse to sign papers guaranteeing a reduction of rents and tithes, and he knew of no one case of personal violence having been offered to such individuals, who were uniformly successful in their resistance to such lawless demands. In all cases of this nature the rioters had retired, threatening perhaps to return on a future day, but they did not. No doubt, if there was not a sufficient military and local force to support persons who acted thus, and repress disturbance, Parliament would be at least as much in fault as the late Government, for having compelled Ministers to adopt dangerous reductions. He repeated, every thing which it was possible to do had been done in the way of despatching detachments of the military, and sending portions of the police of the metropolis (although that was a body intended for other purposes), to aid the local force where the exigency called for such assistance. Every species of civil, military, and legal assistance had been promptly given to the local magistracy.

Mr. *Baring* was convinced that no person could have attended to the duties of his office more assiduously than did the right hon. Baronet; but giving the right hon. Gentleman every credit for a desire to restore the public quiet, still he must say, he was of opinion that the disturbances might have been put down at once by prompt measures; that when more confined and limited than, unhappily, they now were, the disorders might have been crushed and prevented from extending. He feared, that if the disorders went on for three or four days longer, they would extend beyond the reach of almost any power to suppress them. That was his opinion; if there was not force in the country to put down the disturbances, when they only existed in one county, what chance should we have of suppressing them when they extended, as they soon might, over a dozen counties? If there was not sufficient force to repress these disorders, it was the duty of Government to provide it. But he did not mean to say that there was really any deficiency of force to effect this object; on the contrary, he was of opinion that, with a little more vigour at first, and a better application of the force which we possessed, Government might have prevented the evil from spreading as it had.

Sir *R. Peel* ventured to say, that if a proposal had been made by Government last year to increase the military force of the country, in anticipation of disturbances such as now existed,—he ventured to say that the proposal would not have met the approbation of the hon. Gentleman. The hon. Member had said, the disorders might still be put down, and in this sentiment he quite agreed with the hon. Gentleman. Indeed, he saw no reason for apprehension. He thought that, even without reference to a military force, the fact of every man that was menaced being, as was doubtless the case, prepared to fight in defence of his property, was sufficient without such an effort. If aggressions were met by a pusillanimous compliance, no military force would suffice to put down the disturbances. Every man who had landed property had dependents more or less numerous—let him arm them, and they would repel all aggression. A case had occurred in which this was done, and 150 men put down a riot. Let others follow the example, and refuse to make concessions to tumultuous violence, and he would assure the hon. Gentleman that there existed a military force sufficient (when thus aided) to put down the disturbances. But without that, all the military and civil force that could be brought to act—all the efforts of a Secretary of State—were as nothing. Indeed, it would be a perilous state of things if every thing depended upon the energy and sagacity of an individual sitting in an office at Whitehall. It would be impossible for a Secretary of State, or any other functionary, to act with advantage in such cases, unaided by the suggestions of the local magistracy.

Leave of absence was given to Mr. Dundas.

Duchy of Lancaster.] Colonel *Davies* assured his hon. friend opposite (Mr. Spring Rice) that he felt no hostility towards him, or the newly-appointed Members of his Majesty's Government generally. At the same time he must say, he had seen with feelings of the utmost surprise and concern the announcement of the appointment made to the office of Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. He said, it was with surprise he saw Government filling up this place, more particularly after what fell from the present Lord Chancellor the other night in the debate on the Civil List. If Ministers persisted in their present line of conduct with respect to the Duchy, and did not themselves take the matter up, he should consider it his duty to bring the subject of the Duchy of Lancaster before the House immediately after the recess.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, November 23.

Minutes.] The Duke of Gloucester informed their Lordships, that he was authorised to acquaint them that his Majesty had been pleased to elevate Henry Brougham, esq. Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, to the dignity of a Peer of the Realm, by the title of Baron Brougham and Vaux. The Lord Chancellor, on hearing this intimation, quitted the Woolsack, and left the House to robe. He speedily returned, and was introduced to the House as Baron Brougham, by the Marquis Wellesley and Lord Durham. His Lordship took the usual oaths, resumed his seat on the Woolsack, and received the congratulations of his friends.

The Administration of Justice Amendment Bill was brought up from the Commons and read a first time.

Petitions presented. For the abolition of Negro Slavery, by the Bishop of London, the Earls of Rosslyn, Liverpool and Roden, and Lords Wharncliffe and Calthorpe. By the Earl of Shaftesbury, from Wrexham, for a repeal of the Duties on Sea-borne Coal.

The Judgment in Equity Bill, the Arbitration Bill, the Interpleader Bill, the Prohibition and Mandamus Bill, and the Examination of Witness Bill, (Lord Tenterden's Bills) were reported.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, Nov. 23.

Minutes.] New Writs were ordered for the Borough of Knaresborough, in the room of Sir James Mackintosh, now one of the Commissioners for the Affairs of India:—For the City of Norwich, in the room of Mr. Robert Grant, now Judge Advocate General:—For the Town of Nottingham, in the room of Mr. Denman, now Attorney General:—For the Borough of Helston, in the room of Sir Samuel Pechell, now one of the Commissioners of the Admiralty:—For the County of York, in the room of the right hon. Henry Brougham, now Lord Brougham, who had since his election, accepted the office of Lord High Chancellor.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. George Lamb, the number of Felonies and Cases of Assault tried at the Sessions in the several counties of England during a limited period, with an Account of the Costs allowed on each Case, and the total Expense charged to each County:—On the Motion of Mr. Attwood, the Sums subject to the claims of the Creditors of the Nabob of the Carnatic, invested in the name of the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund, in April 1830; and Duty Levied on Foreign Corn.

Petitions presented. For the abolition of Slavery, by Mr. Harvey, from Colchester:—By Mr. Adeane, from Loughborough, and two other places:—By Mr. M. A. Taylor, from the City of Durham:—By Mr. Prittie, from Roscrea, in Tipperary:—By Mr. Wynn, from two places in Sligo:—By Sir P. Egerton, from three places in Cheshire:—By Mr. Foley from two places in Worcestershire:—By Mr. Fardell, from Lincolnshire:—By Sir W. Gordon, from Launceston:—By Mr. James Brown, from Newton Breda:—By Mr. Labouchere, from Taunton:—By Mr. Callaghan, from Cork:—By Mr. J. Johnstone, from Dumfries:—By Mr. Curteis, from Wibringham, Sussex:—By Mr. Spring Rice, from Peebles, Tralee and Milltown, for the Repeal of the Assessed Taxes:—By the Marquis of Worcester, from Monmouth:—By Mr. Byng, for a Repeal of the Metropolitan Police Act, from the inhabitants of the Parish of St. George, and of the Parish of All Saints, Poplar.

[Mr. *Hume* said, the inhabitants of St. George's complained bitterly of the expense of the new police. The previous charge in that parish was about 1,500*l.*, and it was now nearly 5,000*l.*]

By Mr. Houldsworth, from Dartmouth, against the Duty on Sea-borne Coals.

Leave of absence was given to several Members on account of disturbances in the districts with which they are connected.

New Writs.—Conduct of Lord Brougham.] Mr. *Spring Rice* moved that a new writ be issued for the borough of Knaresborough, in the room of the right hon. Henry Brougham, now Lord Brougham, who had accepted the office of Lord High Chancellor.

Mr. *Croker* said, that this motion, although it appeared to be almost one of course, was, considering the circumstances attending it, one of the most important that had ever been made within the walls of that House, and he trusted, therefore, that he should be excused if he ventured to make a few observations upon it. The Gentleman whose place it was now necessary to fill up in that House, and who, by the courtesy of that House, had been usually called an hon. and learned Member of that House, but who now, by a most extraordinary change, was to be called a noble and learned Lord,—the noble and learned Lord, then, had declared publicly and plainly in that House, and with a full view of the change which had now been effected, that he could not by any possibility form a part of that Administration whose creation, when the now noble and learned Lord made this declaration, was plainly, obviously, and certainly, inevitable. He should not have thought so much of this declaration, had not the noble and learned Lord made it voluntarily, and had he not repeated it—yes, repeated it, and voluntarily repeated it—on the next public occasion, and after he had had full time to look at all the bearings of the impending change. He had often heard that noble and learned Lord, while a Member of that House, declare that the characters of public men formed a part of the wealth of England; and as often as the noble and learned Lord had expressed this sentiment, so often had he (Mr. Croker) been prepared to admit the correctness of it, and to participate fully in its justness. If the sentiment was correct,—as from his heart he believed it was,—he must say, that he did think it highly important that the character of the man who was vested with the most eminent and transcendent powers of the State, who was called—by an expression, a sacred expression, but not an extravagant one—" the keeper of the King's conscience," and who, above all, had the disposal of the chief part of the patronage of the Church—he did, he said, think it important in the highest degree that the character of such a man should stand clear of all shuffling intrigue, manly, open, fair, and unclouded, to the view of the public. Certain it was, that if the character of any public man ought to stand thus, the Lord Chancellor was that man; and he could not, therefore, think any apology was due from him for taking this, the most fitting opportunity of reminding the House of those two remarkable declarations which the noble and learned Lord had volunteered in that House. He was ready to hear now, or, if it were not convenient now, at some other time when it might be convenient, the explanation of the reasons which had influenced the conduct of the noble and learned Lord. He was very ready to believe that a satisfactory explanation could be given, but, in the absence of such explanation, and with the present recollection of the voluntary declarations of the noble and learned Lord, he had thought it his duty to make these observations to the House. Allow him to say, that he was altogether at a loss to understand why this motion was not made yesterday; for, considering the declarations of the noble and learned Lord, that he would not take office, and considering also that the noble and learned Lord had given notice of motions on two of the most important and vital questions that could be brought under the consideration of the Commons of England—considering that those notices yet stood in the Order Book of that House—considering these things, he must say, that he did not think the House had been respectfully treated in not being informed, at the earliest possible opportunity, of the appointment of the noble and learned Lord to an office which precluded the possibility of his redeeming those pledges which he had solemnly made to the House. It would be no excuse for this want of respect to the House to say, that the patent of the noble and learned Lord was not made out yesterday; for though still but a right hon. and learned Gentleman, he was certainly Lord Keeper, or Chancellor, or at least Speaker of the House of Lords. They had all seen him there; they had been witnesses to his taking his seat on the Woolsack; and if the noble and learned Lord had hurried forward with breathless haste to take possession of that place of distinction,—if some technical affairs had been set aside in order that nothing might impede the gratification of the noble and learned Lord's desire to exhibit himself to the astonished spectators in that high and splendid character—he had almost said *domino*—in which they had all beheld him;—if these things had occurred, he must say, that he did not think it was respectful to that House not to inform them, as soon as the House of Lords was informed, of this remarkable appointment. He would show to the House what impression the declarations of the noble and learned Lord had made upon the country, and consequently, how necessary it was that a satisfactory explanation should be given of the subsequent conduct of the noble and learned Lord. There were certain organs by which the people expressed their sentiments; he need not more particularly describe the nature of those organs, and he had only to observe, that it was from one of them that he was about to read the passage to which he begged the attention of the House. The hon. Member then read as follows:—" Our Representative, Mr. Brougham, has declared twice in the House of Commons, and, as we learn from *The Morning Chronicle*, also in the Court of King's Bench, that he will not be a member of any Administration that may be formed. According to that paper, the hon. and learned Gentleman stated that 'the representation of Yorkshire was the only place he would have.' A correspondent of our own says—' Mr. Brougham said in the counsel-room yesterday, that he should take no office whatever: that when he was returned for Yorkshire, he made his election between power and the service of the people.' His constituents will learn with great satisfaction the estimate he sets on the honour of their representation. And, indeed, Mr. Brougham already stands in the proudest situation to which a commoner can aspire. Distinguished as he has been so remarkably by the choice of the first county of England, and endowed as he is with such unrivalled powers of doing service to his country, by devising and promoting the most important reforms, he will, in our opinion, be more useful and more illustrious, having rejected the trammels of office, and will have greater influence and power for the accomplishment of his high objects in the House of Commons. Yorkshire will have increased reason to be proud of her Representative, if he should persist in declining a seat in the Cabinet, to which his talents and public services so well entitle him, for the sake of more freely and unreservedly devoting himself to the great causes to which he stands pledged. As an independent Member of the House of Commons, supporting or opposing Ministers as their measures deserve, he would hold the balance of parties, and might compel the Administration to do its duty to the country. Mr. Brougham's motion for Parliamentary Reform, which was to have been made on Tuesday, has been put off till next Thursday, owing to the inconvenience of discussing so important a measure whilst the country is without a Ministry. He declares his fixed determination to bring it on on that day, 'whatever may be the circumstances of the country, and whosoever may be Minister.' We rejoice in this announcement, and have great hopes that this motion will be carried." Now what, he must ask, was the meaning of these declarations on the part of the noble and learned Lord? Had the noble and learned Lord been neglected? or, which was worse, had he been offered something which he did not think equal to his high deserts and to his splendid abilities? Was that the case? and were these declarations intended as a menace, or as a spur to the lazy gratitude of the new First Lord of the Treasury? If so, then let him ask what confidence could be reposed in an Administration which could be influenced by such motives and swayed by such means? If, on the other hand, the noble and learned Lord was perfectly sincere when he made these declarations, then he must contend that it was highly important to the House and to the country, that an explanation should be given of the circumstances which had caused so great an alteration in the views of the noble and learned Lord. He repeated, that he was ready to believe that a satisfactory explanation might be given on this point; but he must again say, that it appeared to him that until such an explanation were given, the character of the noble and learned Lord would be under a cloud.

Sir *J. Mackintosh* said, he begged that no hon. Member would suppose that he rose to give the explanation which the hon. Gentleman had demanded. He did not rise to give any such explanation, for, even if he had one to give, he should withhold it from a Gentleman who certainly was not entitled to call for it. Still less was he influenced in rising by a desire to vindicate the character of his noble and learned friend (Lord Brougham) for sure he was, that the character of his noble and learned friend needed no vindication from him or from any other man, either here or elsewhere; but, above all, here, in a place of which he had been the highest ornament and the chiefest boast. No; the brilliant and powerful eloquence of his noble and learned friend —the services which he had rendered to the people, both in that House and out of it—and the services which he would render to the people in the high station to which he had been so deservedly raised—these would vindicate the character of his noble and learned friend—these would protect the character of his noble and learned friend from assaults, however disinterested, however pure, and however powerful. And if the character of his noble and learned friend had these substantial and impregnable grounds of defence, he was quite sure that hon. Members would think, and justly think, that if he attempted to shield his noble and learned friend from the assaults of the hon. Member opposite, he should be embarking upon a very unnecessary undertaking. The hon. Gentleman had said, that the circumstances attending the appointment of his noble and learned friend might be capable of explanation, and that he was ready to hear that explanation, either now or at any future time. This, coming from such a quarter, was a very extraordinary admission; for he would venture to assert that, to say nothing of the irregular and disorderly character of the speech of the hon. Gentleman, which, from the beginning of it to the end, was composed of nothing but violations of the rules and orders of that House, and which, considered in that light, was, for the disorder and irregularity of it, unprecedented in the annals of Parliamentary offences; he would, he repeated, venture to say, that any honourable and fair dealing man, who could admit that the circumstances alluded to might be capable of explanation, must at the same time be of opinion that nothing could be more improper than to seize upon an occasion like the present for the purpose of making such a speech as that which they had heard from the hon. Gentleman,—a speech which was replete with insinuations and imputations of the most grave character, and which could not be, and were perhaps not intended to be, the less injurious because coupled with the petty, paltry admission, that the circumstances might be explained. It was to give vent to the feelings which this extraordinary speech had excited, that he now rose; for the speech was alike extraordinary and indefensible, if the hon. Gentleman who had made it was sincere in supposing it possible that the circumstance of this case could by possibility be explained. If such an explanation could be given, who were the persons, the only persons, that could give it? Why, the colleagues of his noble and learned friend; and they, he need not tell the hon. Gentleman, were not present. Was it fair, then, in the absence of those who, being the only persons who were acquainted with the communications that had passed upon the subject, were obviously the only persons who could give an explanation which the hon. Gentleman, with seeming candour, admitted might be possible:—was it fair, he would ask, in the absence of these persons, to make this attack? How happened it that the hon. Gentleman had chosen such an opportunity of making this assault—an opportunity which, by his own showing, was the most improper? He denied, however, that any explanation was due under the circumstances which the hon. Gentleman had laid down as the grounds on which he called for explanation. Was the House to call for communications that had passed between the Crown and persons who had been intrusted with the formation of new Administrations—communications than which none could be of more delicate or a more secret nature? Yet these communications, and nothing else, would afford that explanation which the hon. Gentleman demanded. If the hon. Gentleman meant to say, that he would be satisfied with less than this, —that he would take as true the assertion of honourable men, that new circumstances had occurred which caused his noble and learned friend to depart from his former purpose, and that he would be content with a bare statement of the nature of these circumstances, if, he said, the hon. Gentleman meant to take this ground, still it would furnish him with no defence, no excuse, for the conduct he had pursued that night; because all those persons who could satisfy the demands of the hon. Gentleman were unavoidably absent from the House. He need not repeat, that he thought it quite unnecessary that any such explanation should be given to the hon. Gentleman; but his object was to show that, even upon his own case, the speech of the hon. Gentleman was altogether indefensible. The words which the hon. Gentleman had quoted as those which had been used in that House by his noble and learned friend were not according to his recollection,—were not, as he should be ready to swear if called upon to swear, to the best of his recollection,—the words which had fallen from his noble and learned friend on the occasion alluded to. He was not called upon to state wherein the difference between him and the hon. Gentleman, on this point, consisted; but the very fact of the difference existing at all demonstrated the wisdom of that rule of the House which forbade the expressions used by an hon. Member in one debate to be quoted against him in another debate; and this was one of the many irregularities into which the hon. Gentleman had been led that evening. He said many irregularities, which was a very mild expression; to call the hon. Gentleman's speech a disorderly speech would be saying very little, for it was a *congeries* of offences against the rules and orders of the Parliament. Not contented with his own breaches of order, the hon. Gentleman had quoted an anonymous correspondent of a Yorkshire newspaper, in which the words of a Member of that House were set down and commented upon; and in which there was related, on the authority of some prying person, the gossip of the robing room,—which the anonymous correspondent of the Yorkshire editor called the "counsel-room,"—but which was, in fact, the place where gentlemen of the Bar put on and put off their wigs and gowns. He was the last man, he trusted, in that House to narrow liberty of this nature out of doors; but it did appear to him to be improper, in the highest degree, to quote within the walls of that House such an authority, for the unworthy purpose of injuring the character of the Lord High Chancellor of England. Such conduct he would not attempt to characterize as it deserved; but this he would say of it,—namely, that he believed it was unparalleled in the conduct of any man who had ever thought himself obliged to go into the hottest, the most violent, and the most uncompromising opposition. One other observation, and he had done. He begged, that in considering this subject, hon. Members would recollect the day which the hon. Gentleman had chosen for this insidious, this indefensible, and this as the hon. Gentleman admitted it might turn out to be, unfounded attack. It was the day on which his noble and learned friend, vested with the highest judicial functions of the realm, had entered upon the administration of justice, and the exercise of the important duties which had devolved upon him. The hon. Gentleman admitted that the observations he had made were calculated to injure and to degrade the character of the Lord Chancellor in the eyes of the people, unless a certain explanation were given; and that explanation the hon. gentleman well knew could be given only by particular persons, who for some time to come could not by possibility make their appearance in that House.

Mr. *Croker*, in a very low tone, said, that he did not depend upon his own recollection for the words which the noble and learned Lord had used on the occasion to which he had referred; but that, having consulted those channels by which it was well known that the proceedings of that House were communicated to the public, he had found that the manner in which those different channels had reported the words of the noble and learned Lord very nearly corresponded.

Lord *F. L. Gower* begged to assure hon. Members that he had come down to the House that evening without the slightest knowledge that such a discussion as the present would arise, but that he had determined, whenever the opportunity should present itself, to give vent to the expression of his opinion on this subject. He should think himself unworthy of the seat he filled in that House if he kept within his own breast the feelings with which he had heard of the appointment of the noble and learned Lord. Those feelings were not unmingled with regret—with regret that one of the sources of brilliant eloquence, of extensive knowledge, and of profound wisdom, was dried up to that House. His regret, however, was heightened by other circumstances. He had had the fortune to be an auditor of the two declarations which the noble and learned Lord had made with regard to the new Administration, and if he had misunderstood those declarations, he could only attribute it to that obtuseness of intellect which the noble and learned Lord, while a Member of that House, was accustomed to attribute to such Members of the House as happened to differ from him. That noble and learned Lord used to tell the country Gentlemen and other Members of that House, that they could hardly count ten upon their fingers, and that he looked upon them as little better than dolts and blockheads. Now, he had not the vanity—the presumption—to suppose himself excluded from the list of dolts and blockheads; and he attributed it to the fact of his being such a person, that he had, as a plain man, misunderstood the noble and learned Lord's declarations. He did believe, he must confess, that when the noble and learned Lord made those declarations, no man could more distinctly and explicitly have intimated that he had altogether sacrificed office; and, with this belief, he could not delay informing the noble and learned Lord by this, the only means in his power, of what interpretation he had put upon the words uttered by that noble and learned Lord. He did not demand any explanation; but at the same time he thought it right to state, that, in his opinion, the most serious consequences would result if no explanation were given, among which consequences, this certainly would be one,—namely, detriment to the character of a great public officer.

Lord *Morpeth* said, that he looked upon this discussion as altogether irrelevant; but, as it had arisen, he could not refrain from making one observation. If it were thought, that an explanation was necessary, he must say, that he could not consider it either a manly or a sensible course to demand that explanation in the absence of the only persons who could give it. Whatever declarations might have been attributed to his noble and learned friend, he believed that the noble Lord who spoke last would admit that it had never been imputed to his noble and learned friend, that he had said he should be mad to accept the office of Lord Chancellor. And yet such a declaration, made by another noble individual, with regard to another office, which the same noble individual did nevertheless afterwards accept, had not been considered by the noble Lord who spoke last as any detriment to the character of that noble individual; nor had the noble Lord thought that inconsistency any ground for want of confidence.

Mr. *T. S. Duncombe* said, that as a Yorkshireman he must express the regret he felt at the noble and learned Lord having seceded from that honour which he had described in one of his speeches in Yorkshire as a pinnacle which was much too high for him to look down from. He believed that the same regret was felt throughout Yorkshire. The people of Yorkshire had entertained the most sanguine hopes of the success of their distinguished Member's exertions in the cause of reform; but when the projected reform was brought forward, he feared that those hopes would be sadly disappointed. This, however, would not have been the case if the noble and learned Lord had remained in that House; and he must say, that he deeply lamented the time and the circumstances in which that distinguished person had allowed himself to be seduced from the commanding eminence which he occupied in that House. This was the place in which his transcendent abilities were wanted. The noble and learned Lord, when a Member of that House, had often told them of another place, from which they had little to expect, and yet he had gone to that place, never more to return. He believed, from his heart, that that noble and learned person would perform the duties of Lord Chancellor with credit to himself, and with the highest satisfaction to the country. The change, however, had been too hurried. If he (Lord Brougham) had remained there,—the member for Yorkshire,—until he had fulfilled his pledges and redeemed his promises, by carrying through the House his important motions respecting Negro Slavery and Reform in Parliament,—if he had done this, he might have retired to the place he now occupied; and if he had so retired, his appointment would have been hailed with the acclamations of his friends, while his elevation would have added new lustre to the high office of Lord Chancellor, for he would have carried with him the gratitude and the respect of millions.

Sir *H. Hardinge* said, that he should not have troubled the House with any observations on this subject if it had not been for the sneer—the indecent sneer—which the noble Lord (Morpeth) opposite had thrown out, and in consequence of which he felt it his duty to rise in defence of the noble person against whom that sneer was directed. Notwithstanding that indecent sneer,—notwithstanding the bitter malice and the sneers with which the Duke of Wellington had been assailed—malice and sneers which he despised,—notwithstanding these, the character of the Duke of Wellington must and ever would stand high in the history of this country. The sacrifice of patronage, the large retrenchments, the great measure of Catholic Emancipation, which had characterized the Administration of the Duke of Wellington, would hereafter receive the praise they merited from the historian, and the gratitude of the public now, in spite of the sneers of Lordlings. [*Loud cries of "Order," and "Chair, chair," and the Speaker immediately rose*]. He begged pardon: it must be evident that he was speaking with considerable warmth; he had been carried too far, but, perceiving his error, he would not lose a moment in retracting it, and he begged leave, very sincerely, to apologize, both to the House and to the noble Lord. All he meant to say was, that the character of the Duke of Wellington stood too high to be injured by sneers, no matter from what quarter they might proceed.

Mr. *Macauley* was sure that the sentiments which had fallen from the gallant Officer were extremely creditable to him. The warmth with which he had defended his friend, and the candour with which he had instantly retracted a hasty expression—candour which in him could not be mistaken,—were alike honourable to the gallant officer. The observations which had fallen from his noble friend, the member for Yorkshire, and to which the gallant officer had referred, had been made in reply to a sneer from the other side of the House. He agreed with the gallant officer that many of the measures carried by the Duke of Wellington's Administration had been of a most excellent description, and he would instance, amongst others, the great measure of Catholic Emancipation. The noble Duke deserved the gratitude of the country for having, by the carrying of that measure, saved the country from that civil war to which it was exposed a year and a half ago, and that deed reflected greater glory on his name than all his splendid military achievements on the continent of Europe. There were many circumstances to justify the conduct of the noble Lord upon whom an attack had been made that evening. There were but a few days for deliberation, and that at a time when one Ministry was about being formed—when another had just been dissolved;—a time when great agitation prevailed, and when the country required a strong and efficient Ministry to conduct the government of the State; at such a period a few days were as great and as momentous in events as months would be at another period. It was not by the clock they should measure the importance of the changes which might take place in such an interval. He owed no political allegiance to the noble Lord who had been transferred to another place, but as a Member of that House, he could not banish from his memory the extraordinary eloquence of that noble person within those walls — an eloquence which left nothing equal to it behind; and when he beheld the departure of that great man from amongst them, and when he saw the place in which he usually sat, and from which he had so often astonished them by the mighty powers of his mind, occupied in such an exceedingly different manner that evening by the hon. Member who had commenced this Debate, he could not express the feelings and the emotions to which such circumstances gave rise. Was that a time when an attack should be thus made upon the noble Lord in question, and under such circumstances, too, when perhaps no hon. Member present was in possession of the reasons which had influenced that noble Lord in accepting office? Was that a time for a Member of that House, who would sooner have burned his tongue than have made such an attack in the presence of that noble person, thus to attack him behind his back? [*"Order, order"*]

The *Speaker* interposed, and called the hon. Member to order.

Mr. *Macauley* begged pardon of the House if he had said any thing which was out of order. He never meant to say, that any feelings of personal fear would prevent any Gentleman opposite from pursuing such a course. He never considered that it was through the means of personal fear, or intimidation, that that noble Lord had exercised such an extraordinary power as he did in that House. While he sat there, however, there were few present who would venture to make such an attack upon him. Now that he had gone from amongst them, was that the befitting time for an attack to be made upon him by those who, while he was there, dreaded the sarcastic powers of his extraordinary eloquence, and prudently shunned the encounter? He could only deplore that he had not the tongue of that great man to defend him.

Lord *Morpeth* had not uttered any sneer against the noble Duke, whom he highly respected, and he applauded the warmth with which that noble person's friends were ready to defend him. What he had said was, that the noble Duke had made a declaration against taking office, stronger than that of his noble friend, and that had not lost him the confidence of his friends.

Mr. *Croker* likewise explained. He had, he said, never shrunk from an encounter with the noble Lord in question, from a fear of his sarcastic powers. He had sat in that House for many years, and he remembered that upon one occasion he had a warmer discussion with that noble Lord than he ever had with any other man in the world.

Lord *F. L. Gower* disclaimed any thing like personal feeling in the observations which he had made.

Mr. *Long Wellesley* defended the conduct of the Duke of Wellington. When the history of that noble Duke should come to be told, the errors which he had committed would be attributed to the circumstance of his having been badly surrounded. He did not require a better proof of that than was to be found in the conduct of the hon. Gentleman opposite that evening.

Mr. *Charles Wood* said, that he had been instrumental, with others, in obtaining the return of Mr. Brougham, now Lord Brougham, for Yorkshire, and he could assure the House, that the people of Yorkshire would be delighted when they heard of that noble Lord's appointment to his present high office; and he was certain that nothing would give them more satisfaction than that it was upon their chosen Representative the choice of the Crown had fallen in this instance.

The Motion was then put, and the writ for Knaresborough was ordered to be issued.

Colonial Slavery.] Lord *Morpeth* presented a Petition from the town of Leeds, praying for the Abolition of Negro Slavery. The Petition was signed by the Mayor, the Vicar, and upwards of 15,000 of the principal inhabitants in every branch of business, and of every denomination, in that populous and wealthy town. The noble Lord trusted that we had now a Government which would look this important question in the face. He (Lord Morpeth) was determined to give his support —a cordial though a constitutional support —to the present Government, because he hoped that it would be distinguished at home for measures of sound, salutary, and useful reform, and retrenchment; and that abroad its conduct would be described by the single word "peace." He also confidently hoped, that the present Government would exercise a proper vigilance, and adopt efficient measures for putting down the disturbances in the country: at the same time he thought the local gentry and yeomanry in those districts had a duty to discharge, and a part to perform, as well as Government.

Mr. *Labouchere* concurred with the noble Lord in thinking that it was the duty of his Majesty's Government to look this important question in the face—a question which involved the happiness and well-being of 800,000 of our fellow-creatures.

Mr. *Keith Douglas* supported the prayer of the petition. He had that day attended a large meeting of West-India proprietors, and the general sense of the persons present was, that the whole subject should be brought fairly before the country in all its relations.

Mr. *Bethell* thought, that few petitions ever presented to that House were more deserving of the fullest consideration, with respect to the subject of it, and to those from whom it emanated. He trusted, that the whole state of the colonies would be fully gone into. Justice as well as humanity demanded and he was sure that he spoke the sense of all the petitioners when he said, that the inquiry ought to be conducted with calmness, and a firm determination to injure no one.

Mr. *A. Trevor* condemned the wild and visionary philanthropy which would emancipate the slaves before they were fit for freedom. He wanted to know what indemnity was to be granted to the West-India proprietors; and maintained, that the condition of negro slaves was preferable to that of the peasantry of the United Kingdom. He should oppose any measure for emancipation which did not give compensation to the West-India proprietors.

General *Gascoyne* said, that the noble Lord who had presented the Petition had not confined himself to the condition of the slaves, but had alluded to the whole policy of the Government. There was one subject upon which he (General Gascoyne) would take the present opportunity of expressing himself. He alluded to reform, and he would now say, that to any system of moderate reform he should not make any objection. He wished to know from the noble Lord whether or not he had taken up the question since it had been abandoned by the learned and noble Lord who was the noble Lord's colleague.

Mr. *Evans* thought, that it would be a miserable expedient to postpone a settlement of the subject. Sufficient dependence had already been placed upon the professions of the colonial legislatures with respect to preparing the slave-population for free labour. He wished the question not to be decided on any abstract principles, but by a determination to do justice to all the parties interested. He did not believe slavery was so delightful as some hon. Members represented it; and it was nothing but cruel bondage. He wished by no means to do any injury to the West-India proprietors; but he must protest against the question being indefinitely postponed in deference to their fears.

Mr. *Bernal* deeply regretted that a question of such magnitude should be discussed at all, especially so warmly, upon the mere incidental point whether a petition should be laid upon the Table. The subject ought to be looked at with the eyes of statesmen, and not with those of factious partisans. His being a West-Indian land-owner himself should never deter him from speaking his sentiments on the subject, though he had never, and he never would countenance abuses of any kind. Affected religion and bastard morality had been called in to aid the cause of the antagonists of slavery, and to destroy the sacred and recognised rights of property in the West-Indies. He only wished to add, that the West-India interests, tired of having the question so long hanging over their heads, were now anxious that it should be brought forward in some shape or other. All they asked was an honest, impartial, and liberal inquiry into the actual condition of the slaves and of the colonies.

Mr. *Briscoe*, although he admitted that he was not a statesman, felt competent to decide in the abstract, that slavery was a crime, and a foul stain on the character and honour of Great Britain. He had little expected, when he took his seat in the House of Commons, that he should see the day when such an assertion was made, as that the condition of the slave in the West-Indies was preferable to that of the English peasant. He challenged the hon. Gentleman who made that statement to submit the proposal to the most wretched and hopeless of the peasantry, and to be governed by the answer he should receive. As to the rights of the West-India proprietors, he was ready to give compensation whenever a case of loss could be established.

Mr. *O'Connell* denied, that pretended religion or illegitimate humanity had produced the strong feeling prevailing in the three kingdoms against slavery; he denied also, that even an Irish peasant, wretched as he was, would consent for a moment to change places with a negro, who might receive thirty-nine lashes at the will of a man, woman, or child, and who might be torn from his wife and family, that he might be sold to pay his master's debts.

Mr. *Ruthven* said, that if the condition of the peasantry of Great Britain were worse than that of slaves in the West Indies, it was indeed high time for the House to inquire into the sufferings of the labouring poor.

Mr. *Briscoe* wished to understand from the hon. Member who had attended the meeting of West-India Proprietors this day (Mr. K. Douglas), whether they were ready to enter fairly and honestly upon the whole question of the abolition of Slavery?

No answer was given to the question. The Petition to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT.] Mr. *Spring Rice* moved that the House, at its rising, should adjourn to Thursday. There was nothing on the papers of the House for Wednesday but the Colonial Trade Bill, and it would be most convenient that public business should not be proceeded with until the return of those Gentlemen who had recently vacated their seats upon taking office. He had no doubt that many persons concerned in Election Petitions, or in Private Bills, would be desirous of a longer adjournment; but, after the decision to which the House had come the other evening, he did not feel it his duty to call for a longer adjournment.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* thought, that after the decisions to which they had come respecting the despatch of business, it was to be regretted that any postponement should be required. Thursday was fixed for the Ballot for three Committees, and on that occasion it would be necessary that 180 Members be present. Otherwise the House must adjourn, and adjournments must be repeated *de die in diem.* Now, for his part, he did not wish to be an alarmist; but he would say that, in the present state of things in several parts of the country, there were many hon. Gentlemen in that House whose duty required them to be elsewhere to watch over the tranquillity of their own districts. He had already, on a former occasion, expressed his opinion, that everything ought to be done by the House to enable Gentlemen to attend to that important duty; but the House had come to a contrary decision, and he feared that the result would be, great inconvenience to the House, and to those interested in Election Petitions.

Mr. *Stuart Wortley* protested against further alteration. When the House had on two occasions decided that it would proceed at once to the consideration of the Petitions on Elections, any postponement would occasion excessive inconvenience and expense to those parties who had made arrangements, founded upon the Resolutions of the House. He hoped that his hon. friend (Mr. Rice) would not move for any further postponement. He was desirous that on the evening fixed for the ballot, they should be able to assemble a sufficient number of Members. If that should not be the case, and, consequently, repeated delay should be occasioned, he thought it would be necessary to resort to a call of the House.

Sir *George Warrender* was of opinion, that there would be no necessity for further postponement. His hon. friend (Mr. S. Wortley) seemed to him to consider the difficulty which the House might meet with, in proceeding with Election Petitions, greater than it really could be. By a late Act of Parliament, it had been enacted that 100 Members were sufficient to make a House for the ballot. Therefore, he did not fear that they should fail in assembling a sufficient number. For his part, he would attend regularly.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* explained, that when there were ballots to be taken for three Committees, the presence of 180 Members was necessary; if for two Committees, 120 Members must be present; if for but one Committee, 100 Members, as the hon. Baronet had stated, were sufficient.

Mr. *Home Drummond* said, that he had voted against delay; and now that the House had decided that the Petitions should be proceeded with immediately, he was of opinion that postponement repeated from day to day, would inflict injustice on persons concerned in the petitions.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that if Petitions were not pending, he might not have departed from the course usually pursued on occasions of such change as had just then taken place in the relations in which some Members stood towards the country and the Government. It was by no means unusual to ask for an adjournment of several days. Certainly it was not unreasonable to ask for a delay from that to Thursday. It was his intention to move on that day for a further adjournment to the following Tuesday, and then again to Thursday. On the last-mentioned day he should move an adjournment to whatever time might then seem necessary to allow all those Members who had accepted office to be re-elected.

Sir *Robert Peel* was aware of the excessive inconvenience occasioned by the discussion of questions connected with the public business, in the absence of Members of the House, who were also members of his Majesty's Government. He could not, therefore, hesitate to acquiesce in the Motion of the hon. Gentleman opposite; and he thought it right that the days fixed for the sittings of the House should be those for taking into consideration Election Petitions. As there could be but one opinion respecting the propriety of accommodating the Gentlemen "now sitting at the other side of the House," he expressed his entire acquiescence in the Motion.

Motion agreed to.

LIEUTENANT-GENERAL OF THE ORDNANCE.] The Report of the Committee of Ways and Means being brought up,

Mr. *Hume* took that opportunity of asking his hon. friend opposite (Mr. Spring Rice) whether the office of Master-general of the Ordnance had yet been filled up? And also, whether it was the intention of the Government to appoint a Lieutenant-general of the Ordnance?

Mr. *Spring Rice* was not yet certain that the office of Master of the Ordnance had been filled up; but with respect to that of Lieutenant-general of the Ordnance, he knew there was no intention of filling it at present.

Board of Control.] On a new Writ for the Borough of Knaresborough, in the room of Sir James Mackintosh, who had accepted the office of one of the Commissioners of the Board of Control for the Affairs of India being moved for,

Mr. *Hume* hoped, that the new Ministry would consider how unnecessary and how excessive was the expense occasioned to the country by the Board of Control, and determine not to continue it. He had great objection to numerous Boards, and still greater objections to the changes that were continually made in them. He was of opinion that if the Board of Control was necessary, no one could be fitter for the office than Sir James Mackintosh. His observation was intended to be general, and he must say, it seemed to him as if these offices were kept only for the sake of patronage. With the exception of changing the Lord Chancellor with every Ministry, which was abominable; he knew nothing more mischievous than the frequent changes of the public Boards, to answer the purposes of Ministerial patronage. The interest of nearly 100,000,000 persons was intrusted to the Board of Control, and it ought, therefore, to be constituted of persons of great eminence, talents and practice, not removable at the pleasure of the Administration. He did not make this remark as an objection to the present Ministry, but as stating a general principle that ought to be followed.

The writ was ordered.

Distress in Ireland.] Mr. *Wyse* presented a Petition from the labourers of the town and neighbourhood of Tipperary, praying for legislative relief in their great distress. The Petition, the hon. Member said, was most numerously signed, but couched in language the most temperate, and evinced much of that forbearance which characterizes the Irish peasant in the midst of all privations. The petitioners complained of a total want of employment for six months in the year, of the high rent of land, and of the weight of local taxation. Either of these causes was adequate to produce much misery, and, unfortunately, they were usually combined in the most fertile portions of the island. The extensive coast of Connaught and Munster exhibited an excess of wretchedness unparalleled even in the most degraded parts of continental Europe; but from this taint scarcely any portion of the country was totally exempted. Few counties in Ireland could boast a larger share of natural advantages than the county which he represented—the fertility of its soil was, even in Ireland, proverbial—yet the common cause of pauperism there, as elsewhere was uncorrected by the bounties of nature, or the anxious efforts of a patient and energetic population. In the town of Tipperary there was formerly a small but thriving manufacture of woollens, which, from the rapid superiority to which the same manufacture has attained in another country, has been totally extinguished. It supported a very considerable portion of the industrious classes, who were now, as in so many instances in Ireland, thrown exclusively on the land. The competition for land had so augmented rent, that, in the neighbourhood of that town, no less than 12*l*. or 13*l*. per acre was paid. When to this was added the burthens of local taxation, county or Grand-jury cesses, church-rates, &c., scarcely sufficient was left for the mere sustenance of the lowest state of animal existence. The Petitioners stated, that even these sacrifices they would willingly submit to, were they convinced that, by what was wrung from their hard earnings, any equivalent was returned to the cultivator—but it was a vicious circle throughout—great distress produced proportionate discontent; discontent required a larger mass of physical force to control it; and the support of this physical force, necessary to the Government, drew still deeper upon the energies and gains of the peasant, augmented his distress, and would continue to augment it, until at last swelling beyond all bounds, it would overflow every dyke which mere coercion can raise against it. That Ireland had been rapidly advancing to a state of things, appalling to every eye which looked beyond the present was unhappily too notorious. The only question was, by what means the Legislature, could stay the giant evil in its terrific progress, and step in between the country and revolution by a salutary reform, which would not dally about the high places of society, but go to the root of the whole evil. Petitions like this gave a plain representation of the moral cancer which was feeding on the country. They invoked the Legislature in time to lay its healing hand on the disease; it was spreading over the sound parts—a few years longer, and it would defy remedies—and the Legislature would be in time only to witness the dissolution. What did the petitioners demand? It would be well for hon. Gentlemen, who, night after night, proclaimed in terms alarming to the boldest politician, the disorganized state of counties in the immediate neighbourhood of the metropolis,—it would be well for those hon. Gentlemen, usually so loud when any symptoms of a similar disease shewed itself on the surface in Ireland, to contrast the character and causes of these disorders in both countries. Whence arose the turbulence of Kent, Sussex, Hants, and Surrey? From the same causes as similar tumults had arisen in Ireland—want of employment, high rents, and enormous taxation. But what a difference in the demands of the labourers in the two countries! The petitioners here wished to force the farmer to give them from 2*s.* 3*d.* to 2*s.* 6*d.* wages: the petitioners whose prayer had just been heard declared themselves ~~willing~~ to work for 6*d.* only. They felt that discontent and distress walked together—that idleness led to disorder—that the unoccupied hand would at last grasp the midnight torch—and that crime and bloodshed, and anarchy, would take the place which Government was preparing for them. His Majesty's present Ministers had professed, when on the other side of the House, an anxiety to attend to the wants of Ireland: they had now the power, as they had then the wish. A more glorious task never awaited any Administration. The support which they could hope from the Members for Ireland must depend upon their attention to the interests of Ireland; but that attention, if not given instantly, might as well not be given at all. To provide employment for the poor should be the first principle of the Government; and until measures were brought forward for that purpose, it would be vain to talk of the pacification, because it would be vain to talk of the prosperity of Ireland.

Mr. *Hume* was afraid, that the hon. Member had imposed an impossible task on the Government, in calling on it to provide employment for the unemployed poor in Ireland. It seemed to him a prevalent error with Gentlemen from the other side of the water, to suppose that the evils complained of in Ireland could be removed by the introduction of a Bill into that House. Nothing could be more erroneous than such an opinion. He believed that a commutation of tithes, and the placing Church property on the same footing as other property, would have the effect of giving employment to the great majority of the poor of Ireland. He hoped, therefore, that some measure of this kind would be introduced by Government; and if it were supported by the hon. Members for Ireland, it would do more towards relieving that country than any plan which he had yet heard advocated for the employment of the working classes.

Sir *Robert Bateson* expressed his approbation of the valuable observations which had fallen from the hon. member for Tipperary, and he hoped that he would take every opportunity of drawing the attention of the House and the Government to the situation of Ireland, and to the means of ameliorating the condition of the people. If the hon. member for Middlesex would excuse him, he would take the liberty of telling him, that there were many things which would be of material consequence to the well-being of Ireland with which he seemed to be unacquainted. He knew that that hon. Gentleman was desirous of doing everything in his power for the improvement of Ireland, but the remedies he recommended would not produce the result he wished for. There were many other things which affected the comfort and happiness of the people, besides the tithes and Church-rates. The local payments were, perhaps, more burthensome than the general taxes. He hoped that the immediate attention of the Government would be directed to improve the state of Ireland; and Ministers might be assured, that they would meet with an ample reward in the increased loyal feelings of the people. The local taxes were peculiarly oppressive; and in the county of Londonderry, many respectable farmers whose condition had been above mediocrity—were now reduced to poverty by the operation of these rates. Sums to a very large amount were annually collected in Ireland from the farmer, which in England were derived from other sources. There were many farmers who had to pay more than the amount of their rent in local taxes, called grand Jury assessments; which were devoted to purposes never thought of in this country. The assessment last year amounted to not less than 20*s.* an acre in the district of Magherafelt, in the county of Londonderry. The sum paid as tithes in no part of the north of Ireland was equal to that? If these rates were laid out in improving the country, there would be some remuneration to the farmer; but the larger portion was expended in a manner which could not be of the least service to him. The expenses of the County Infirmary and Hospital, and other institutions were paid out of these funds. To the farmer, those institutions, however excellent, were of no use, and that he was obliged to support them was one of the great grounds of complaint, which something must be done to relieve. With regard to the observation of the hon. Member respecting tithes and Church property, he could not agree with him that they were oppressive, or that their abolition would be such a material benefit to the farmer. At the same time he was prepared to admit, that great good had been derived from the operation of the Tithes Composition Act; he could assure the hon. Member, that in the part of the country to which he belonged, the conduct of the clergy was marked with the utmost forbearance and humanity, and that there was nothing oppressive in their mode of collecting tithes. Tithes were not nearly so oppressive as the County-cess. Whatever might be the practice in other parts of the country, tithes were there only paid on corn and hay, and none were levied on green crops. Tithes were never taken on turnips, potatoes, or any other green crops in the county of Londonderry. The situation of the farmer was, however, such, that every payment was felt by him; though hardly any rate was so little oppressive as tithes. Distress prevailed to a very considerable extent in the north of Ireland, and until means were found of procuring employment for the people, little could be done for their advantage. Until inducements could be held out to capitalists to embark their money in establishing manufactures in that country, little could be done for the improvement of the people. He was not willing to adopt the opinions of political economists respecting a superabundant population existing in Ireland; yet he could not disguise from himself that capital and population did not bear a proper proportion to each other. Some of the important manufactures of Ireland were completely gone to decay, in consequence of the policy adopted by this country. The linen-trade, formerly the staple of Ireland, had for some time been on the decline, and was fast falling into decay. It supported a vast number of persons in the north of Ireland in comparative comfort, and nearly all the peasantry in those districts were enabled to pay their rent by growing flax. The introduction of foreign flax, and the importation of foreign linen, had almost driven the trade from those districts. In consequence, the condition of the farmers and the labouring population of the north of Ireland was much deteriorated. Unless means were adopted to improve the trade, the distress would increase. At present most of the peasantry, in consequence of these circumstances, were unable to pay their rents. He did not mean to assert that a change in the commercial policy of England was not necessary, but it had been attended with the most disastrous results in Ireland. He trusted that the attention of the new Government would be directed to that part of the empire, and that its resources would be made available for the general good. He agreed with the hon. member for Middlesex, that it was not men but measures which the country desired. The new Administration he hoped would produce a change in the artificial state of that country, in which there was an appearance of great wealth, surrounded by the reality of the most squalid poverty. The misery of the poorer classes far surpassed anything to be seen in any other part of the world. He believed that his Majesty's Ministers wished to do something for Ireland, and if he saw them inclined to do that, they should have his humble support. If they pursued a system of strict retrenchment, they would find that the greater portion of the Irish Members would side with them. Notwithstanding the distress prevailing in Ireland, the spirit of discontent was not manifested nearly to the same extent there as in other parts of his Majesty's dominions. In that country, and especially in the north, obedience was shewn to the laws; and he was satisfied, that a very little exertion on the part of the House, would excite a feeling of gratitude in the peasantry of Ireland, which would be attended with the most happy results. With the improvement of the condition of the people, there would be an increased feeling of respect for the laws and the Constitution, and all classes increase in brotherly love and affection.

Sir *R. H. Inglis* said, he concurred with the hon. member for Middlesex, that it would not be in the power of the new

Administration—it was not, indeed, in the power of any Administration—to create employment for the people. The truth was, that a Government could rarely do good in matters of this kind, though it might do harm by interference. The hon. Member, however, went on to state another proposition, apparently in contradiction to his first; namely, that one of the measures by which the situation of Ireland could be ameliorated would be, by some Act on our part, to place Church property there on the footing of other property. Upon this subject he would only say, that he was not aware that any such measure was necessary, or that Church property was placed on any other footing than lay property. Both rested on the same laws, and must stand or fall together.

Mr. *Hudson Gurney* observed, that the statements of this petition was so very extraordinary, particularly when connected with the speeches of the hon. Member who presented it, and of the hon. Member on the same bench with him, that he wished for some slight explanation of allegations which he scarcely thought it possible he could correctly have understood. The petition stated, that land in Tipperary was let for the incredible sum of 13*l.* per acre —that the people were totally unemployed, and in the last state of destitution. The hon. member for Tipperary stated, that these poor persons only asked for employment, and were willing to labour for 6*d.* a-day; and he went on to say, that his support, and the support of the Members for Ireland, would depend on the new Government affording, or not affording, to the people of Ireland that employment; and, of course, paying those sixpences. The other hon. Member stated, that the main grievance of Ireland was the amount of the Grand Jury assessments, which, in some instances, rose to 20*s.* per acre; that is, those very men who, as landholders, exact from a population, said to be in the extremest poverty, the most enormous rents, do, as grand Jurors, lay these additional assessments on the tenantry—and then come to England to demand employment and pay for their people, and seek to redress all Irish grievances by Act of Parliament. In point of fact, the only bond of union which existed amongst Irish Members of all descriptions, in that House, the only thing, be they of what party they might, in which they all agreed, was, that the opulent amongst the Irish, and the Irish proprietors, were never to be taxed, either for national purposes, or for the support of their own people—that England was to pay everything—and that every oppression, and all suffering consequent on it, which took place in Ireland, was, under every change of Administration, invariably to be charged on the Government of England.

Mr. *O'Brien* perfectly agreed with the hon. member for Middlesex, that it was not in the power of either the Government or the Parliament to remedy the evils of Ireland, by the enactment of any measure, such as those in question, but he believed that it was in the power of the Government to produce a more healthy ratio of population to employment than at present existed there. That could only be done by relieving the land of those great masses of pauper population which were at present subsisted on it. If this evil were remedied, it would not be difficult to prevent a similar increase of the people. He was satisfied that if all the revenues of the Irish Church were confiscated, they would go but a little way to find employment for the destitute population; and he was decidedly opposed to any such measure, as it would occasion much evil. With respect to the new Administration, he must observe, that if they only fulfilled one-third of the promises held out, they would satisfy the people of Ireland.

Sir *Robert Bateson* observed, in explanation, that what he said was, that the County-cess, in many districts, amounted to 20*s.* an acre, while the rent was not more than 30*s.* an acre. The cess was not the act of the landlord. The Judge directed the grand Jury to make certain assessments, which they are bound to do, by virtue of their Oath. They were compelled by the law, as laid down by the Judges, to allow certain charges, and it was the law, therefore, which was oppressive.

Mr. *Ruthven* expressed his regret that a discussion of this importance should be entered into in the then thin state of the House, and that such subjects had so little interest for hon. Members.

Mr. *Wyse* wished to explain, that he did not state, as the hon. member for Newton seemed to suppose, that the rent of land in the county of Tipperary, was 12*l.* or 13*l.* an acre; but that the petitioners stated, that they, at present paid that rent for small portions of land in the neighbourhood of Tipperary. At the same time, he could safely declare that this was not a singular case; potatoe ground being leased in every part of Ireland at nearly as high a rate. This high price of land did not arise from the exorbitancy of landlords, but from an unnatural and pernicious competition, the consequence of the want of manufactures or other outlets for the industry and intelligence of the community. Landlords could not control the market, and were as much affected by this state of things as the peasants themselves. The hon. Gentleman seemed surprised and irritated at the coalition and importunity of Irish Members whenever the subject of the wants of Ireland was brought before the House. The fault which he found was precisely the reverse. Irish Members were neither sufficiently warm nor importunate. They applied to England, and to whom else should they apply; not certainly from a feeling of inferiority, or from a spirit of servility, but from a sense that they had not been treated with justice. Why did Ireland apply?—because she was in a state of wretchedness bordering on desperation. But who and what had brought her into this state? How came it that her fields were neglected, her commerce contracted, and her manufactures quenched? It was, because, the people at large, the sinews and strength of all social improvement, were studiously shut out from a full participation in the advantages of the Constitution, and a faction, set up, in the place of the nation had availed itself of its toils, monopolized its benefits, and had left to the rest of the people nothing but the pain and difficulties of providing for the luxuries of their masters and oppressors. This policy, he rejoiced to say, though at a far too late period, had at length been changed; but its evil traces had remained. England had governed Ireland for many centuries and been the cause of its misery. Ireland now asked for no bounty, no patronage, but asked the payment of an old balance—the bringing up of an old arrear—the atonement for past errors and past injuries. Little disposition had yet been evinced to make this honourable atonement, but the time had come when it could not and must not be delayed. The hon. member for Middlesex ridiculed the idea of a Bill to provide employment for the people being brought into the House, and pointed out an alteration in Church property as a substitute. He knew as well as that hon. Gentleman that it was not in the power of that House immediately to provide employment for the large population of Ireland; but that was no good reason why efforts should not be made to remove difficulties and to get rid of obstacles which stood in the way of finding that employment. Take off the charge of the grand Jury and tithe systems—take off the duty on coals, which operate as an actual impediment to its use in the manufactures which depend on it, and something would immediately be done to give the people employment. The Ballycastle colliery was close to Dublin, but it was found cheaper to bring coals from Scotland for the Irish capital than to get them from the neighbouring colliery. There was not a steam-engine employed in a single manufactory in Dublin. Government might grant the enterprising and industrious loans, repayable at a reasonable interest. That had already been advantageously done in Ireland; why not extend the scale of its operation? If found good in some instances, why not try it in others? All these were fit objects of legislative interference. Where then was the absurdity of calling on his Majesty's new Administration to bring forward bills on these and such remedial measures, if they value the good order and tranquillity, or, in other words, the prosperity—without which to think of tranquillity was an idle and pernicious dream—of a fine, fertile, but singularly-neglected country. With regard to the property of the Church, he felt with the hon. Member, that all property should be made to share the burthens of the state, and he thought it disgraceful that the Church property should be exempt from these burthens. He would not moot the question of vested rights, but would say, without fear of contradiction, that all property was held under certain conditions, and that the property of the Church was as much held under such conditions as any lay property in the country. One of these conditions was, the repair of churches; another the support of the poor: neither of these conditions, had been properly fulfilled; and the consequence was that two new taxes had been thrown on the country. The burthens had been shifted from the Church to the State, or rather, from the shoulders of a small and rich community to those of a large and starving community. This state of things he should like to see amended; but, in the interim, and in addition to such amendment, he could discover no good reason why the poor should not be employed, and our national resources raised, by the application of capital, from where they now sleep, into life and activity. He was fully persuaded of the obvious moral truth, that peace could only be maintained by actively engaging in useful works the physical and mental energies of that country; and desiring peace, he desired to see the means employed that was most likely to preserve it. The Reports of 1819, 1823, and 1830, could leave no shadow of doubt on this head. The only districts exempt from tumult in 1822 were those in which the inhabitants were fully employed. Contrast Clonakilty and Waterford, with the turbulent districts of Cork, Tipperary, and Limerick. The petition which he had presented he looked upon as a prayer for the happiness of the people at large, and the tranquillity and good order of the empire, and as such he warmly recommended it to the earnest consideration of the House.

Petition to lie on the Table.

HOUSE OF LORDS,
Thursday, Nov. 25.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. For the abolition of Negro Slavery, from various parts of the country, by the Earls of HARDWICKE, HADDINGTON, SPENCER, RODEN, and CARNARVON, by the Lords WHARNCLIFFE and DURHAM, and by the Archbishop of YORK, and the Bishop of DURHAM. For the Repeal of the Duty on East-India Sugar, by the Earl of RODEN, from Wexford.

NEW POLICE.] Lord *Durham* presented two Petitions, one from the parish of St. Leonard, Shoreditch, signed by 4,000 persons, and the other from the parish of St. John ,Southwark, against the Metropolitan Police Act The petitioners, he said, called for the abolition of the force called into existence by that Act. After what he had said on a former night on this subject, it was scarcely necessary for him to say that he did not concur with the petitioners in calling for the abolition of the force. At the same time he thought that an inquiry ought to be granted into the subject.

REFORM IN PARLIAMENT.] Lord *King* rose to present a Petition from the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Corporation of the City of London, in Common Council assembled, praying for a Reform in Parliament. He presented this petition with great pleasure, as he had long been a friend of reform; and he presented it now with greater satisfaction than he could have done had he presented it ten days ago, when it first came into his hands: because then there presided over the country a Ministry, which had declared by its chief in that very House, that he had no plan of reform to bring forward himself, and that, if any other person brought forward a plan, he would always oppose it while he remained in office. After such a declaration, he should have felt that the presentation of this petition, so far as regarded the fulfilment of its prayer, was a hopeless task. He presented it, however, to their Lordships now, after the gratifying declaration which had been made on a recent evening by his noble friend opposite, with a strong confidence that it would meet with a more satisfactory reception. He would take that opportunity of observing, that the declaration of his noble friend was satisfactory to him, as he hoped it would be to all reasonable persons. They could look for nothing more than that the plan of his noble friend should give satisfaction to the country, and restore the confidence of the people in the Commons House of Parliament. That was as much as could be expected from his noble friend in any declaration of general principles. He had no doubt that his noble friend would follow up his declaration in the most proper and advantageous manner. That there were defects and blots in the representation of the people in the House of Commons, was a point that no man could deny. The defects were, that the great towns, which had grown into importance during the last two centuries, or rather during the last century, were not represented; the blots were to be found in the existence of what were generally denominated the nomination boroughs. It was notorious that a scandalous traffic had long existed of votes for patronage. Those whom Mr. Grattan had well described as the proprietors of Parliament had too long enjoyed a monopoly of patronage. He firmly believed that no plan of reform would give satisfaction to the country which did not put an end to the nomination boroughs, which were now used only for the detriment and oppression of the people. It was owing to the influence exercised over

Ministers in the Commons House of Parliament by those proprietors of Parliament, that the country had been burthened so long with the most expensive, the most extravagant, and the most profuse Government that the world had ever seen. As to the other object which his noble friend had expressed his desire to accomplish,—namely, cheap Government,—he would only say that it was his firm conviction that an unsparing retrenchment could not be carried into effect without a reform in Parliament. The petitioners prayed, he said, for such a reform as would restore to the House of Commons that control over the taxation of the country which it had formerly possessed, and which it ought always to exercise The greatest and best argument in favour of Reform was, that the House of Commons had not exercised that control for years; and to him the want of reform appeared clearly proved by the fact, that those reductions which might have been made, and which therefore ought to have been made, fifteen years ago, were only made within the last year or two, when the demand for them became so strong that it could not be resisted. As this petition came from so respectable a body, and as its statements were very short, he begged that it might be read at the Table by the clerk.

The Petition read.

Lord *King* presented a Petition from the Burgh of Brechin, praying for a reform in the representation of Scotland. He would only call the attention of their Lordships to one fact contained in this petition, and that was that the forty-five Members for Scotland were elected by 3,000 persons.

Regency Bill.] Lord *Lyndhurst* gave notice, that he should move the second reading of this Bill to-morrow, and then requested that their Lordships should be summoned for that day. He said that he gave this short notice of his intention to bring on the second reading of this Bill to-morrow, on the assumption that no opposition would be made to its principle. From what had occurred on the night when he brought in this Bill, he did not anticipate any objection to the principle of the Bill. Any alteration that might appear necessary in the details of it, could be best made when the Bill was in Committee.

Earl *Grey* rose to confirm his noble friend in the assumption which he had just made. He was not opposed to the principle of the Bill; on the contrary, he approved of it: indeed, it was impossible for him to do otherwise, for the noble Lord had stated the very same principles for which he had always contended when the Regency had been made a subject of public difference and discussion. To the principle of the Bill, he repeated, he had no objection; the details were, as his noble friend had said, the proper subject for consideration in the committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, Nov. 25.

Minutes.] Petitions Presented. For the abolition of Slavery, by Colonel Powell, six from places in Wales:—By Mr. Adeane, five from the Isle of Ely, and other places in the County of Cambridge:—By Colonel Abercrombie, from a Parish in Scotland:—By Mr. Schonswar, from Hull, and from two other places:—By Mr. Lester, from Poole:—By Mr. Guest, from Honiton, Devonshire:—By Mr. Tyrell, two from places in Suffolk:—By Mr. O'Connell, from New Ross, in Ireland:—By Mr. N. Calvert, from several places in Herefordshire:—By Mr. Kemp, from the Town of Lewes:—By Mr. Warburton, from Bridport:—By Lord W. Powlett, from several places in Durham:—By Mr. Pendarvis, from places in Cornwall:—By Mr. Hume, from Arbroath and Hammersmith:—By Mr. Severn, from places in Radnorshire and Monmouthshire:—By Lord Stanley, from Bolton, and other places in Lancashire:—By Sir W. Jolliffe, from Petersfield:—By Mr. Curteis, from Horsham:—By Lord J. Stuart, from a place in Glamorganshire:—By Mr. W. Sturt, from four places in Bedfordshire:—By Mr. J. Wood, from a parish in Lancashire:—By Mr. Fortescue, from two places in Devon and Lancashire:—By Mr. Grosvenor, two from Chester:—By Mr. Wilks, from Matlock, Westham, Essex, and a place in Lincoln:—By Mr. Evans, from several places in Kerry:—By Mr. Rice, from Youghall:—By Mr. Johnstone, from Dunfermline:—By Sir R. Bateson, from Downpatrick. By Mr. Wyse, from certain inhabitants of the Town of Galway, praying for an extension of the Elective Franchise in that place. By Mr. Macnamara, from Ennis, for a Repeal of the Legislative Union, between England and Ireland:—By Mr. Boyle, from Cork, against the Repeal. By Sir W. W. Wynn, from certain inhabitants of Denbigh, against the Truck System. By Mr. O'Connell, from the Rev. Thomas Smith, of the City of London, complaining that he had been seventeen years in Orders without obtaining any Church preferment, while benefices were lavished upon wealthy Bishops and other non-resident Pluralists; and from Roman Catholic Inhabitants of the County of Mayo, complaining of the unequal distribution of Public Grants for Education in Ireland.

Bills brought in. By Lord Howick, to give validity to acts done by the Governors of Colonies, in his late Majesty's name, after his decease. By Mr. Spring Rice, to apply money out of the Consolidated Fund for the service of 1830.

Bequests of Roman Catholics.] Mr. *O'Connell* obtained leave to bring in a Bill for the better securing the Charitable Donations and Bequests of his Majesty's subjects in England and Wales professing the Roman Catholic religion. The hon. Member observed, that he had brought in a similar bill last year. He did not intend to press it beyond a first reading till all the Ministers should be in the House; but he wished to have its principle understood. In Ireland, the charitable establishments of Protestants and Catholics were upon a similar footing as regarded the security of bequests made for their support. The case was different in England; there was, indeed, no Statute at present in force to prevent the erection of Roman Catholic schools, or the establishment of Roman Catholic charities in this country. Lord Eldon had decided that point; but at the same time he declared, that the existence of Roman Catholics in England being contrary to the spirit of the law, there could be no protection for Catholic charities. The noble Lord was undoubtedly right in his interpretation of the law as it then stood; but since that period the Relief Bill had been passed, and it effected an important alteration in the spirit of the law, by conferring legislative rights upon the Roman Catholics, and declaring that they were entitled to all other civil privileges, upon taking certain oaths. Thus, with respect to Catholic charities, what was merely toleration before became now a right. His wish was, that a law should be passed declaratory of this right, and which should place the Roman Catholics of England and Wales upon the same footing in this respect as Protestant Dissenters.

CHURCH RATES.] Mr. *Wilks* moved for a return of the amount of Church-rates levied, and of mortuary and burial fees received, &c., by the various Churchwardens in England and Wales, and how expended, in the year 1830. The hon. Member expressed his surprise that such returns were not annually made to Parliament as they were of great importance. It was not generally known what immense sums were raised in the name of the Church of England. Some returns though inaccurate had formerly been made to the other House, and by them it appeared that very nearly a million a year was collected under the name of Church-rates. He hoped that there would be no objection to the motion.

Mr. *Spring Rice* would not oppose it, but he hoped that notice had been given of the hon. Member's intention.

Mr. *R. Inglis* said, that the returns in question could not be made out without immense labour on the part of those from whom they were required; that great expense would be incurred in procuring them, and that commensurate advantage would not be derived from them. He therefore recommended that the Motion should be withdrawn or he should oppose it.

Sir *C. Wetherell* also opposed the Motion as being of no utility.

Mr. *Hume* did not think that the labour would be so great, for accounts of such receipts and expenditure must be kept by the Churchwardens in the various parishes in the country; and if they were not kept, they ought to be kept.

Mr. *G. Lamb* said, that there would be excessive difficulty, delay, and expense in procuring such returns. He believed too that no care could make them accurate. No less than 14,000 letters must be written. He had, otherwise, no objection to the Motion.

Mr. *Warburton* supported the Motion, on the ground that it would be a warning to all Churchwardens and public officers to keep their accounts in a state for public inspection.

Mr. *Goulburn* opposed the Motion, on account of the inconvenience and expense attendant upon the making out of such returns. It would make the House the auditor of all the parish accounts in the kingdom which was quite unnecessary as those accounts were already audited by those who were more interested in curtailing the expenditure. The returns would, he believed, be quite useless after causing an immense expense to procure them.

Mr. *J. Wood* said, that one of the great grievances of which the people had to complain was, that in many instances their parochial affairs were managed by select self-elected vestries, and he therefore should support this Motion. Such returns would check the extortion of parish parliaments,

Sir *R. Peel* did not understand that there was any unwillingness on the part of the Government to afford every information on this subject, but the present motion was resisted on the grounds of inconvenience and expense. He (Sir R. Peel) should have no objection if the hon. Member who had spoken last would move for the production of those parochial accounts in which he was personally interested—to wit, those of the town of Preston,—to give his assent to such a motion.

He recommended the hon. Member who had moved for these returns to withdraw his motion for the present, and to endeavour by local inquiry to ascertain what might be the result of such returns, and whether they could be furnished at a moderate expense commensurate with the advantage to be derived from them. Such an inquiry should be made before they proceeded to incur an expense of at least 1,000*l.* or 2,000*l.*

Mr. *T. P. Courtenay* concurred in the observations of his right hon. friend, and opposed the Motion.

Mr. *Leader* said, that such information had been already obtained with regard to the parishes in Ireland, with little difficulty or expense, and he did not see why it might not be also obtained with respect to the English parishes. In the present state of the country no species of inquiry should be refused which would enable people to ascertain the amount and extent of their burthens.

Mr. *Spring Rice* did not think that, without a suggestion of general abuse, they should go into a general inquiry. The returns which had been procured from Ireland had been obtained at very great expense, and they had been found almost totally useless for the objects which he (Mr. S. Rice) and others had in view when they were called for.

Mr. *Wilks* said, he should withdraw his motion for the present. At the same time he was of opinion that the returns of such an expenditure as 700,000*l.* or 800,000*l.* a-year, which was the amount of the Church-rates, should be laid before Parliament and the country; and he was determined to take another opportunity again to bring forward this subject.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.] Mr. *S. Rice* moved, that the House should, at its rising, adjourn to Tuesday next. He named that day for the adjournment, as a ballot for an election committee was fixed for it. Of course no debateable business would be fixed for that day, and the bills which he (Mr. S. Rice) had fixed for it would occasion no discussion.

Sir *G. Clerk* took that opportunity to state, that a petition from the agent for the Queenborough petition had been put into his hands, praying that the ballot for the committee on that petition should be postponed from Tuesday next until after the recess. Probably there would be no objection on the part of the House to comply with the prayer of the petition.

After a few words from Sir C. Wetherell, Mr. Fyler, and Mr. Wynn, who conceived that it would be impossible to grant the prayer of this petition, Sir G. Clerk consented to withdraw it.

The Motion for the adjournment was then put, and agreed to.

LAW OF REAL PROPERTY.] Mr. *Campbell* gave notice, that it was his intention, soon after the recess, to move for leave to bring in bills for the alteration of the laws of property and succession; for a change of the law as it respected dower, for the purpose of enabling parents to become the heirs of their children; for the abolition of fines and recoveries, with a view to the substitution of other assurances in their stead; and also for a change in the law of Limitation. The hon. and learned Gentleman stated, that he did not apprehend that the bills in question would meet with much opposition, as they had been framed in compliance with the unanimous recommendation of the commissioners appointed to inquire into the state of the law.

On the Motion of Mr. Rice, it was ordered, that the Speaker should issue a supersedeas on the new writ for the election of a Burgess to represent the borough of Preston, in consequence of a legal informality in the hon. E. G. S. Stanley's acceptance of the office of Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, Nov. 26.

MINUTES.] Petitions Presented. For the abolition of Negro Slavery, from various Religious and other Bodies in different parts of the Country, by the Earl of RODEN, the Duke of BEDFORD, Lord WHARNCLIFFE, the Marquis of LANSDOWN, the Earl of CARNARVON, and the Bishop of LONDON.

On the Motion of Lord LYNDHURST, the Regency Bill was read a second time.

Lord TENTERDEN's Bills were, on his Lordship's Motion, read a third time and passed.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM, AND NEGRO SLAVERY.] Earl *Grosvenor* said, he had been intrusted with a Petition from Chester, which related to two subjects of the greatest possible importance; and his noble and learned friend then on the Woolsack, who had so long been the ornament of the other House, and was likely to be the ornament of this—having becoming a Peer—he could not avoid adverting to the important topics which that petition contained, as he was anxious to give him an opportunity—if he chose to avail himself of it—of correcting some misrepresentations, and replying to some attacks which had been made against him in another place. From all that he had heard of his noble and learned friend's sentiments, they were coincident, he believed, with those which had been expressed by the noble Earl (Grey) on a recent occasion, in a speech which would not be easily forgotten, both on the subject of Parliamentary Reform and the other subjects to which he had alluded. His own opinions upon Parliamentary Reform, and the necessity of economizing to the quick, were well known; and happy would it have been for the country if reform and retrenchment had been begun several years ago. As to the other topic dwelt upon in the petition, namely, negro slavery, he expressed his anxious hope that some period would be fixed when slavery should be abolished throughout his Majesty's dominions.

The *Lord Chancellor:* My Lords, I have listened with great attention to the few observations which have been made by my noble friend upon these two questions that must be considered of paramount importance, whether we regard the interests of the empire, or the public duties of statesmen to the entire world. I am obliged to my noble friend for the opportunity he has afforded me, but as many other opportunities will occur, and at no very distant period of time, it prevents the necessity of my declaring my opinions at present. That my opinions are known to my noble friend on the topics to which he alludes may be true—that they may be known to other noble Lords, in common with the great mass of my fellow-citizens, is probable, and I hope is not for my disadvantage. That any noble Lord should know so little of me I hope is not the case, as for a moment to suppose, that in any circumstances in which I can be placed upon this earth, my opinions, my feelings, my principles, my wishes in favour of both these great questions, always of extreme, and now of urgent importance to this empire, could suffer change, or that any thing could even induce me to abate one iota of the zeal which swells my bosom in these matters. At least I trust there can be but few who know so little of me, even from report, as to suspect me of such a change. It is painful to me, and the more so from the unexpected appeal of my noble friend, that now, when, for the first time, I have the honour of addressing your Lordships, excepting in your judicial capacity, I should be called upon to speak of a subject in every way of such inferior importance as myself. Nevertheless, misrepresentations have gone abroad, and remarks of an unfriendly nature, touching the consistency of my public conduct, have been made elsewhere, and therefore, as my noble friend said, he was anxious to give me an opportunity of setting right the one, and repelling the other; and should I now shrink—or rather let me say—should I decline offering a few words in deference to your Lordships, and I may add, out of respect to myself, after the call which has been made on me, it might wear the appearance of shrinking, not from the expression of my opinions—not from a readiness to correct misrepresentations, but from the attacks which have been made on me, if, indeed, the observations to which my noble friend alludes were intended as attacks. It will be sufficient, however, to say very briefly, that I bear and shall bear with perfect equality of mind everything that may be said of me in any quarter whatsoever—that I am not at all surprised—but the contrary—that a person, respectable for his knowledge and talent—nay, even distinguished for the exercise of that knowledge and talent—has been led into errors of me, from ignorance of my character; and that I bear with an equal mind, what has been said by that individual, under the influence of mistake. I am not astonished at the observations which have been made by persons in another place, for they cannot be more astonished (and as a matter of astonishment I understand the observations to which I allude were introduced, and I do not say they were intended as an attack)—they cannot feel greater astonishment than I myself do at my consenting to my elevation to the distinguished place which I now hold in his Majesty's Councils. My Lords, I am not surprised at their astonishment, and only say, that I share it with them; for they cannot be more stricken with wonder than I am that, at this late period—at this eleventh hour, that I should have overcome my repugnance to resign my high station, as Representative for Yorkshire, than I was myself when I did overcome that repugnance; that I who up to that time when I am reported to have stated my intention of not severing myself from the representation of Yorkshire; which intention, by the by, I never did state; but when I am said to have made that statement, I no more contemplated the possibility of my being prevailed upon to quit the station I held for that I now occupy, than I, at the present moment, fancy I shall ever go back to that House from which the favour of his Majesty has raised me. I need not add, that in changing my station in Parliament, the principles which have ever guided me remain unchanged. When I accepted the high office to which I have been called, I did so in the full and perfect conviction, that far from disabling me to discharge my duty to my country—far from rendering my services less efficient, it would but enlarge the sphere of my utility. The thing which dazzled me most in the prospect which opened to my view, was not the gewgaw splendor of the place, but because it seemed to afford me, if I were honest—on which I could rely; if I were consistent—which I knew to be a matter of absolute necessity in my nature; if I were as able as I was honest and consistent—a field of more extended exertion. That by which the Great Seal dazzled my eyes, and induced me to quit a station which, till this time, I deemed the most proud which an Englishman could enjoy, was, that it seemed to hold out to me the gratifying prospect, that in serving my King I should be better able to serve my country.

The Petition laid on the Table.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, Nov. 29.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By the Marquis of CLANRICARDE, from Bellclare, Galway, praying for the Repeal of the Union. And from the Catholics of Kelvine and Kelgeevir, for a more equitable distribution of the Funds destined for education in Ireland. By the Duke of RICHMOND from Billinghurst, Sussex, for Radical Reform. By the Earl of ELDON, from the Merchants of Glasgow, connected with the West Indies, praying for protection to their property. For the abolition of Slavery—by the Earl of ELDON, the Earl of TANKERVILLE, the Earl of WINCHILSEA, Earl BATHURST, and Lords DACRE, WHARNCLIFFE, CALTHORPE, and FARNBOROUGH; a great many Petitions chiefly from Protestants, Dissenters, in various parts of the Country.

STATE OF THE COUNTRY.] Lord *Wynford* said, that he rose for the purpose of giving notice, that he would to-morrow move for leave to bring in a Bill to lessen the expense of legal proceedings. He would take the opportunity of asking a question of the noble Earl at the head of the Government, whose speech the other night, he must say, he had heard with the utmost satisfaction, and particularly that part of it which related to the present state of the agricultural districts. With regard to the distresses under which the country unhappily laboured, he begged to ask the noble Earl if he was prepared to institute any inquiry into the causes and the extent of those distresses, with the view of alleviating them, and preventing future disturbances? He begged further to ask, whether it was the intention of his Majesty's Government to confer on Magistrates such additional powers as might enable them to put down those disturbances which had now grown to so serious a height in various parts of the country?

Earl *Grey* felt confident, that it was not necessary for him to assure their Lordships that the matters, to which the noble and learned Lord had alluded had been, and would continue to be, constant subjects of consideration to his Majesty's Government. He certainly had no intention to propose that such an inquiry as the noble and learned Lord had mentioned should be instituted; but there would that night be a committee moved for, which would include no inconsiderable portion of the subject, and if it were thought desirable by their Lordships that the powers of that committee should be carried further, he should have no objection to accede to a proposal to that effect. With respect to conferring additional powers on Magistrates, it had not yet occurred to him that any such step was necessary. The law, as it at present stood, had been found by active Magistrates, who exerted themselves properly, to be sufficiently powerful to put down disturbances. He had, therefore, no intention to increase the power of Magistrates. Indeed, it was his anxious wish, except a case of absolute and extreme necessity should arise, not to depart from the provisions of the law; but if any such case of absolute and extreme necessity should unhappily arise, their Lordships might be assured that he would not be backward in asking from the Legislature such further powers as the exigencies of the case might require.

The *Lord Chancellor* fully concurred with the noble Earl in the opinion he had expressed with regard to the efficacy of the existing law to put down the disturbances that prevailed. Until the law as it now stood had had a fair trial, it would not be expedient—nay, it would hardly be just—to alter it for the purpose of meeting those occurrences which unfortunately had arisen, but which he devoutly hoped would be found only of a passing and temporary nature. Every thing, however, should be done to enforce the provisions of the law; and he had no doubt that there would be an end to those disturbances, which were alike disgraceful to the people concerned in them, and ruinous to the object they professed to have in view; for there was no truth, he apprehended, more obvious than this—that in proportion as the public peace was disturbed, in the same proportion must the misery of those be augmented who suffered in consequence of the state of the public affairs being deranged and troubled. Holding, as he then did, a very high and responsible office with respect to the magistracy of the country, he trusted that their Lordships would accept in good part, and particularly the Lord-lieutenants of counties, the suggestion which he would take that opportunity to make? Far be it from him to desire to interfere generally with the discretionary powers which were vested in the Lord-lieutenants, and which they had in most cases exercised with a discrimination, impartiality, and correctness highly honourable to themselves; but there were some instances of names being omitted in commissions,—some instances of persons being passed over, whose powers, whose activity, and whose character, would make them desirable accessions to the present force of the magistracy. He did not allude to any district in particular, nor even to disturbed districts only, because those which were now peaceable might be disturbed—but to all districts in which such omissions did exist; and he was sure, that when the character of the persons to whom he alluded was considered—when it was recollected, that besides being men of courage, and activity, and power, they were also not unfrequently the possessors of large hereditary property,—he was sure, he said, that when these qualifications for a place among the magistracy of their respective counties were considered, the suggestion he now made would be sufficient, and that care would be taken that such omissions should not occur. He was sure, he repeated, that it was not necessary for him to do more than suggest, for it would be incomparably more agreeable to him if the noble Lords who held the office of *Custos Rotulorum* would supply such omission themselves, than leave them for him to supply; but if it should turn out, that he was too confident on the subject,—if he should find that anything more than suggestion was necessary—which, he repeated, he was sure it was not—then he begged leave to assure their Lordships that he would apply himself to the subject; and he should feel he was not properly using the important powers vested in him if he did not exercise those powers to prevent the recurrence of omissions which it was at all times, and especially now, so highly important to guard against.

The Earl of *Eldon* said, that he took it to be quite clear that the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack was invested with the right to determine who should, and who should not, be Justices of the Peace; and, consequently, that it was in the power of the noble and learned Lord to take care that the magistracy was efficiently supplied. During the five and twenty years that he was Chancellor, he had been greatly indebted—and he begged now to acknowledge and to return his thanks for the obligations—to many noble Lords for recommendations of persons who were fit to be Justices of the Peace. It was obvious that a Lord Chancellor was not always capable of judging of the fitness or unfitness of persons to be Magistrates; and he must therefore say, that he felt greatly indebted for those recommendations. The only case in which he had ever interfered was, if he recollected right, when the late Bishop Barrington thought proper to strike out a person from the commission; and then he did interfere, because he thought that none but the Lord Chancellor ought to have this power. He did not recollect a single instance in which he had refused a recommendation; but he had always taken care that no Lord-lieutenant should strike out any person named in the commission. Having said thus much, he would only add, upon this subject, that he was convinced that a Lord-lieutenant, as *Custos Rotulorum*, was the person who ought to have the nomination of Magistrates, because he generally had accurate knowledge of who were proper and who improper persons to be Magistrates; but that, in the event of efficient persons being omitted, it was in the power, and, he might add, it was the duty of the Lord Chancellor to correct those omissions whenever they came under his observation. And now, in what he was about to say, he did hope it would not be thought that he intended to make any imputation against the late Administration, or against the present Administration,—he did hope it would not be thought that he intended to insinuate that not enough had been done to put down these disturbances. He knew, because he had experienced, how easy it was to blame the conduct of others: and no man could be more sensible than he was of the importance, nay of the absolute necessity, of proceeding with caution in circumstances of great peril. He saw, therefore, with the greatest satisfaction, that Special Commissions were to be sent into the disturbed counties; and, he hoped, not into the disturbed counties only, but into others also. Why did he say so? He said so because it was the great principle of the law of England, that justice should be administered in mercy, and there could not be an act of greater mercy to the misled and deluded people of this country, than to have persons sent down to them who would explain to them the nature and the provisions of the criminal law. Many—yes, very many, he was sure—were not aware of the criminality which attached to the offences they had been led to commit. He had been reproached, and others had been reproached, for not amending the criminal law; but the difficulties of the subject were greater than persons usually esteemed them to be; and, to a mind like his, they were, he was free to confess, insuperable. For they must have—they could not avoid having—a general description of crime; and it constantly happened that many cases fell within that general description, which were not foreseen nor expected by the framers of the law. An impression had gone abroad,—and it was with surprise and regret that he stated the fact,—an impression had gone abroad among the people, that they might meet together, and, if they used the language of begging, that they might employ all menaces which attached to formidable numbers. No impression could be more dangerous than this; and he did therefore hope, that those learned men who were about to be sent into the counties in which disturbances existed would take the trouble,—and if they did take the trouble they would have the blessings of the country,—would take the trouble of explaining to their deluded and mistaken fellow-countrymen the law of the land, and the reasons of the law, and the reasons why it was for their interest, and to the interest of the community at large, that it should remain the law of the land. He did believe that a few charges, properly and distinctly expressed, would be received with the spirit with which they ought to be received, and would correct the errors which unhappily prevailed at present. If, too, a more severe sentence should be passed than these deluded men had been taught to expect, he did hope that a distinction—a marked and obvious distinction—would be made between the misleaders and the misled. He had been told—God knew how true it was—that one of our county gaols was full of persons, who were not natives of this country. He fervently hoped that this was not true. In making these observations he had endeavoured to keep clear of all inflammatory topics, and he hoped it would not be thought that he had intended to cast blame on any one. Let him be believed when he assured their Lordships, that at his time of life, and at such a conjuncture, he could be actuated only by a desire of performing his duty.

The *Lord Chancellor* begged to say a few words in explanation. When he had intimated that he would on all occasions defer systematically to the recommendations of the Lord-lieutenants, he had by no means forgotten the power which was reposed in him who held the Great Seal. He thought he had rather indicated to their Lordships that he recollected at once the existence and the nature of that power. All that he wished to state was, that without some unusual case occurred, he should be slow to interfere, and for this obvious reason,—namely, that local knowledge was necessary for a safe choice. Fully aware of the powers with which he was invested, he had, nevertheless, thought it a more delicate course to give this intimation than directly to interpose. He would take this opportunity of doing that which he should have done when he was upon his legs before if he had recollected it—namely, of giving notice, that on Thursday next he should move for leave to bring in a bill for the more effectual administration of justice in England and Wales, by means of Local Courts. To this bill he should beg most particularly to call the attention of the noble and learned Lords on the cross bench.

Viscount *Melbourne* begged to say a few words in confirmation of what had fallen from his noble and learned friend on the Woolsack. He joined with his noble and learned friend in urging the Lord-lieutenants of counties to take measures for placing in the Commission of the Peace such individuals as, after careful inquiry, should be found, from their activity, zeal, and character, proper persons in whom to repose that confidence. There appeared to be some difference of principle in the motives for selection in different counties. In some, certain persons were included, in others they were excluded. He would not say which was right, or which was wrong; but he again begged noble Lords to consider well what description of persons it was advisable to introduce into the commission, and not to omit any who were likely to discharge the duties of the office with firmness, impartiality, and discretion. With respect to what had fallen from the noble and learned Lord opposite, the present was not the time to discuss that subject. He agreed with that noble and learned Lord, that many of the persons who had been lately led into the commission of crimes new in this country, were not aware of the extent of their offence; and he also agreed with him that it was necessary that the law should be speedily expounded, and carried into effect where necessary, but that the execution of it should be tempered with lenity whenever it should appear that the offenders were ignorant, and had been misled. If, however, the necessity should take place—which he trusted to God it would not-- if the disturbances should spread—he had no wish to create delusion, but he had great hopes that they would be prevented from spreading—if, however, they should spread, his Majesty's Government would take measures promptly to suppress them, to preserve the public peace, and to maintain the authority of the laws. As to the fact stated by the noble and learned Lord, that there were many persons, not natives of this country, in one of our gaols, he hoped some allowance would be made for the circumstances under which he had come into office, and that it would not be expected that he could at present possess all the information necessary to meet such an allegation: but this he would say, that he had no reason to believe, that the noble and learned Lord's statement was well-founded.

The Earl of *Eldon*, in explanation, said, that the statement which he had made was contained in a letter which he had that morning received. If, on further inquiry, he found that the statement was well-founded, he should feel it his duty to wait upon the noble Lord, and communicate to him the circumstances of the case.

The Earl of *Falmouth* observed, that the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government had said, that it was not his intention to propose any new measure in order to strengthen the law, unless in a case of extreme necessity. Now to him it appeared that a case of great, if not of extreme, necessity actually existed. A noble and learned Lord had told their Lordships, that one of the gaols was filled with persons apprehended during the recent disturbances, who were not natives of this country. It was notorious that many incendiaries, who had been unable to throw their own countries into flames, had issued forth to spread destruction elsewhere. It was not to be doubted that the greater part of those engaged in the recent outrages were English; but it was also probable that some foreigners were mingled with them. He admitted that the Special Commissions which were about to visit the disturbed districts were calculated to be useful; but he was apprehensive that they had not sufficient power to lay hold of the miscreants—the incendiaries, who were the really guilty persons. The farmers were compelled to go to the expense of protecting their property by night watches. This was an extraordinary scene, and appeared to him to require extraordinary powers and measures. No man was more attached than he was to our free institutions; no man was more jealous of liberty. But if there was any truth in the axiom that the public safety should be the supreme law, the present times came, in his opinion, within the meaning of that axiom, and demanded that some powerful measures should be adopted. He was persuaded that it would be impossible to lay hold of the incendiaries in question unless some strong measure—some temporary Alien Bill, should empower the Government to seize on any suspicious foreigners, and compel them to give an account of themselves. A measure of that description might be limited in its duration to three months, to two months, or to one month; but some such measure was absolutely necessary.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, that after the fullest consideration which he had been able to give to the subject, he did not see any reason or ground for thinking that any alteration in the existing law was necessary. The outrages which had taken place in the country were of two descriptions. The first was that open description of outrage, which there was no doubt might be got the better of by the operation of the ordinary law. The second was that description of crime—the destruction of property by fire, of the perpetrators of which Government had not hitherto been able to discover any trace whatever. It was supposed by some noble Lords that they were foreigners. He did not believe, however, that there was any evidence whatever of that fact. It was a description of crime that was certainly effected by a conspiracy of some kind or other; but whether the conspirators were foreigners or Englishmen no man could possibly say. As to foreigners being in gaols, he could only say, that with reference to one county in which outrages of the most flagrant kind had occurred, there was not one foreigner among the persons with which Winchester gaol was filled. He would trouble their Lordships with a few words on another subject, which had been introduced into the present conversation. He thought that it was desirable for Government to abstain as much as possible from interfering with the recommendation of the Lord-lieutenants with regard to the magistracy. Deeply interested as those noble Lords naturally must be in the security of the property, and the preservation of the tranquillity of their respective counties, they would, of course, select persons proper, and calculated to do their duty in assisting in the administration of justice. He had no doubt that those noble Lords would, however, attend to the suggestion of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, and that they would introduce a sufficient number of proper persons into the Commission of the peace. It was evident that, in most cases, local knowledge of character was indispensable before any individual could be safely recommended for the magistracy; and he therefore earnestly advised the noble and learned Lord, to abstain as much as possible from interfering with the recommendation of the Lord-lieutenants.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* observed, that with respect to the county with which he was connected, he could add his testimony to that of the noble Duke, that up to the present time there was no ground for believing that the fires which had been so prevalent throughout the country were the work of foreigners. He differed, therefore, from the noble Lord, who was of opinion that some extraordinary legislative measure was necessary. He believed that the existing laws were sufficient to restore peace and tranquillity. From the Commissions which were about to proceed into the country, he anticipated great benefit; and he thought that the measure was an act of great mercy to the deluded people. In Kent he knew that the people were ignorant of the law, and ignorant of the punishment which the course that they were pursuing must bring upon them. He trusted, therefore, that the Commissions which were going forth into the districts in which the law had been violated, would be productive of great advantage. He had not been in the House when the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government had explained the course which his Majesty's Government intended to pursue, but he had read that speech with great gratification; and he was persuaded that the sentiments which it contained would be highly satisfactory to the great body of his Majesty's subjects. He was prepared to give his most cordial support to his Majesty's present Ministers in whom he had perfect confidence. Their determination to restore a constitutional representation should have his warmest concurrence. He congratulated their Lordships on seeing the Government of the country placed in the hands of talent and character, capable of meeting with effect the dreadful exigencies of the times.

Lord *Carberry* thought it his duty to call their Lordships attention to proceedings of a most inflammatory description which were persevered in by some parties in Ireland. In particular, he begged to call their Lordships' attention to a meeting which took place on the 23rd instant, and at which most inflammatory language was used. He should think it a dereliction of duty not to advert to the subject and would beg leave to read the report, published in an Irish paper, of a speech then made by Mr. Maurice O'Connell, at a public meeting in Dublin:—"Mr. Maurice O'Connell was loudly called on from all parts of the room. He rose to address the meeting amid the most enthusiastic applause. He felt, he said, the most sincere satisfaction at beholding so respectable a meeting as was then collected around him, and at that particular juncture of public affairs. Since they had last met, the iron statue with feet of clay had been prostrated to the earth—a golden idol was about being erected in its stead, to which, like its predecessor, they might expect to see all the servile in spirit, in the House and out of the House bow down in lowly adoration. It was at such a juncture as the present that he feared lest the people should be led away by the word of 'promise to the ear,' but which had been ever broken by the fact—that, in the hope of a trivial good, they should have been deluded from the prosecution of that measure which could alone confer on them peace, happiness and prosperity—the repeal of the Union. The present Ministry, however, assured him, that his fears were vain, and that the people could not be deluded by any party of men. The truth was, that the persons at present coming into power had, while out of place, declared themselves against the wishes of the people: now that they were in power, they were not very likely to be more favourable to them. They had often seen that the man who, when out of power, was an advocate for the people, the moment he obtained it, underwent a magical transformation; and the trappings of office were frequently found to change his principles. The Irish, too, had seldom felt themselves in a better situation under those who called themselves their friends, than under those who avowed themselves their enemies. The time of delusion had now passed, and for ever; the assembly there that day proved that the people would persevere in seeking for a repeal of the Union, and that they would not be diverted from that glorious object by half measures—by Poor-laws, by grants of public money, and by the last invention to benefit Ireland—by the permission to the people to transport themselves to America at their own expense. The spirit of patriotism was spreading like the old signal flame on their hills—the spirit that was lighted in one parish was instantly transmitted to another—the flame extended from county to county—and all Ireland would soon feel the genial glow of the sacred fire which should for ever burn on the altar of a free country. They saw the same spirit animating the venerable Mr. Arthur and the young gentleman who had last addressed them—youth, sensibility, and middle age, were animated with but one feeling and desire, and that was —the determination to obtain a repeal of the Union. After some other eloquent observations, Mr. O'Connell called upon every man, in every part of the country, to use his influence, however limited that might be, to have petitions forwarded for a repeal of the Union. If every man did this, it was not at all improbable, that before the end of the Session, the honourable House would be settling the conditions and terms of that impracticable measure—the repeal of the Union between Great Britain and Ireland. By every man exerting himself to the utmost of his power, in his own sphere, they might soon expect to see the Union flag fall from the tower of the Castle, and the green flag of Ireland raised in its place." His Lordship proceeded to observe, that if it were a crime to call on the people of Ireland to rebel, that crime the speaker of this speech had committed; and he expressed his conviction, that unless such proceedings were put a stop to, all Ireland would be in a blaze of insurrection in less than a month. The noble Lord also read the following letter from the Roman Catholic Bishop, Dr. Doyle.

"*Carlow, Nov.* 18, 1830.

"Dear Sir.—Though I regret being drawn into public notice, I cannot but appreciate highly the vote of thanks with which the numerous and very respectable meeting of the inhabitants of the parish of Booterstown, in which you presided, lately honoured me. May I beg you will convey to them the expression of my gratitude, and accept for yourself my sincerest thanks.

"The Union question is one of great difficulty and importance. I have given to it all the consideration of which I am capable. I am unable to calculate all the consequences of a repeal; but, so far as I can do so, they appear to me useful to both countries—favourable to public liberty, and embracing those great and salutary reforms which a united Parliament will be slow and timid in effecting in Ireland.

"I don't much attend to what has been reported as said by a certain class of persons, whether in or out of Parliament, on the repeal of the Union. These persons, not all of whom are competent to form a clear or sound judgment, are generally men who have other interests than those of the great body of the English and Irish people; persons who are swayed by those interests, or by unfounded fears or idle apprehensions. Those persons, and such as those who are 'clothed in purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day,' are averse to all change, are often dull of intellect, fond of ease, heedless alike of public misery, and of those encroachments on the liberty, and on the fruits of industry which scarcely ever reach themselves.

"The people should not be swayed by these men, for they neither feel nor suffer along with them; nor should the Government repose on their power or their influence, for power and influence, especially in Ireland, are not always allied to rank and wealth.

"With great esteem, on account of your exertions for years past to serve the poor, and to promote the general interests of Ireland, I have the honour to be, dear Sir, your faithful humble servant,

"*John Reynolds, Esq.* "JAMES DOYLE."
Merchants-quay, Dublin."

His Lordship added, that if such proceedings were put an end to, Ireland would be the most prosperous country in the world.

Lord *Wynford* wished to give a notice, and he would give it for a distant day, in the hope that the subject might be taken up by some one more competent to treat it than himself, that he meant to bring the distressed state of the country under their Lordships consideration. He was persuaded that if something were not done to remove the discontent of the great body of the yeomanry of the country, the most serious consequences would ensue. He therefore gave notice, that on the 9th of December he would move for an inquiry into the distressed state of the agriculture, commerce, and manufactures of the country, and into the means of mitigating that distress.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE POOR LAWS.] The Marquis of *Salisbury* rose to move for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the Administration of the Poor-laws. He had always been of opinion that the population of the country, although it might at some period exceed the immediate means of support, was generally by no means too great. The experience of last year had convinced him that the population engaged in agriculture was not too great. With respect to wages, also, it would be found on inquiry that wages at present were not only equal to those of former days, but superior. Comparing the present price of labour, with reference to the price of provisions, with the price of labour from the beginning of the seventeenth, to the beginning of the eighteenth century, it appeared that it was a third higher now than formerly. Since the war the reduction of the price of corn had been considerably greater than the reduction of wages, except in cases in which the perverse system had been adopted of paying the wages out of the poors' rates. Looking at all the circumstances, distressed as the agricultural labourer was, his wages were higher now than at former periods. One great evil which the labourer at present endured was, the extravagant rate of house-rent. Another was the absence, in consequence of the improvements which had taken place in manufactures, of all sedentary employment for his family. The great object to be accomplished was, in his opinion, to procure a regular and steady and sufficient supply of labourers, and at the same time to take care, that the supply did not become greater than the demand, and the condition of the labourer reduced beyond that of comfort and competent subsistence. The course pursued in this country in effecting improvements in agriculture had, he was sorry to say, tended much to deteriorate the condition of the peasantry. In former times it was the custom to give the peasants employed in the culture of the estates of the landed proprietor or the farmer, a cottage to live in, and a garden and a piece of ground to cultivate; but every considerable proprietor of late years had directed his attention to what was called clearing his estates, so that the peasantry were driven together to occupy hamlets in herds, and their allowance and means of subsistence reduced to the lowest sum on which it was possible to eke out their existence. The great object to which he wished to direct the attention of their Lordships was, to devise some means for procuring and supporting a body of men, who would prove sound, good, laborious, and virtuous assistants in the labours of the farmer, and who would at the same time be enabled to live comfortably on the produce of their labour. At the present moment he feared much that the process of clearing the farms had produced a state of things among the peasantry of this country somewhat similar to that which was represented elsewhere to have taken place in the neighbouring kingdom of Ireland, but represented in terms which he hoped, for the honour of humanity, would be found to be very much exaggerated. In the inquiry which he meant to propose to their Lordships, he hoped that the law of settlement would be taken into full consideration, and he felt very sanguine in the expectation that some measures might be devised, by means of an alteration of that law, which would raise the labourers from their present deplorable state, and give hope to those who had now almost abandoned themselves to despair. He also thought, that the Government might be induced, by proper inquiries, to direct its attention to the colonies, and that regulations might be made with respect to the present expensive military corps employed in them, which would tend materially to forward the object he had in view. The great end, however, which he proposed, through the labours of that committee, the appointment of which he required from their Lordships, was to remedy the evils of the Poor-law system, and correct the errors which flowed from the mal-administration of that admirable and beneficent Act, the forty-third of Elizabeth; because he conceived that the greater portion of the offences perpetrated in the disturbed districts had arisen from the low rate of wages at which the peasant was compelled to work through the operation of the Poor-laws. He felt, that he had already trespassed too much on the time of the House in explaining the objects of a motion for a committee, which he understood was not to be resisted; but he could not help expressing a hope, that through the labours of that committee, in a zealous and anxious examination of the present system of administering the Poor-laws, they might ultimately succeed in bettering the condition as well as raising the moral character of the peasantry; and he trusted that, in the event of its being found necessary, the pecuniary assistance of the Government would not be wanting to carry the recommendations of the committee into effect. There was only one other topic to which he would at that moment advert, and that was the state of the bastardy laws. He conceived the laws on that subject to be extremely defective. According to the present system, no person in the humbler stations of life could escape imprisonment, as the consequence of not making provision for his offspring, unless he consented to marry the mother, and thus improvident connections, and all their consequences on the parents, increasing unnecessarily the supply of labourers, were actually made a subject of legislative provision. After observing that it was his intention to bring before the House all the evidence which could be collected relative to the state of the country, and the condition of the labouring classes, the noble Marquis concluded by moving for a Select Committee, to take into consideration the present state of the Administration of the Poor-laws, and to report thereon to the House.

Earl *Grey* said, it was not his intention to make any objection or to offer any opposition to the motion of the noble Marquis, and he therefore should not, at that moment, trouble the House with any observations on the questions which that motion involved, further than to say, that there could not in his opinion be any more important subject brought before the attention of a committee of that House, than an examination of the method of administering the Poor-laws, with a view to the amelioration of the condition of the labouring classes. He hoped, therefore, that their Lordships would acquiesce in the motion of the noble Marquis without entering into any detailed examination of the subjects which it embraced. For his part, he could only say, that all the topics connected with the question would, in his opinion, be discussed with much more propriety, and much greater advantage, when they came to consider the recommendations contained in the reports of the Committee; and he thought, too, that under the present peculiar circumstances of the country, it was extremely desirable to avoid the danger of increasing the existing excitement, or of fostering expectations which it would not be in their power to realise. For that reason, among others, he trusted that at the present moment the Committee would be granted without any further discussion; but he hoped that the noble Marquis would prosecute his inquiries with a view to the result which he proposed. He wished to state then, without holding out any expectation on the subject, that if any measure should occur to the Government, which they might think necessary in the interval between the appointment of the noble Marquis's committee and the communication of the result of its inquiries to Parliament, the Government would feel itself at perfect liberty to propose such measures; but at the same time he should not feel justified in neglecting to avail himself of any evidence which the noble Marquis might have collected in the interim, but which he might not have had an opportunity to lay before the House.

Motion agreed to, and Committee appointed.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, Nov. 30.

MINUTES.] Bills. The Earl of WINCHILSEA postponed *sine die* the second reading of his Bill for Finding Employment for Labourers. The Administration of Justice Amendment Bill was, on the Motion of Lord TENTERDEN, read a second time.

Petitions presented. By the Duke of RICHMOND, from Matthew Phillips, pointing out a method of Employment for the Poor. By the Earl of GROSVENOR, from St. George's, Middlesex, for a Repeal of the Metropolitan Police Act, to which his Lordship expressed himself favourable. For the abolition of Slavery — by Lords BEXLEY, WHARNCLIFFE and KING, the Earls of CARLISLE and RODEN, the Archbishop of CANTERBURY, and the Bishop of LONDON, from a great number of places.

SLAVERY—AMBULATORY COMMITTEE.] Lord *Napier*, in presenting a petition from Gallowshiels in Scotland, praying for the gradual abolition of Slavery, said, that in the course of his services it had fallen to his lot to visit the principal places in which slavery prevailed. He could therefore speak upon the subject with the advantages of actual experience, and he could assure their Lordships, that slavery was an affair of considerably more importance than people generally thought it to be. His experience, and the consideration he had given to the subject, had led him to this opinion, namely—that their Lordships would never understand the matter until it was thoroughly examined by a committee of their own number. He did not mean a committee which should be roasting up stairs during the summer months, and which should listen to the evidence of self-styled philanthropists and philosophers, who would come before them with a lie in their right hands, for the purpose of deceiving their Lordships,—he did not mean such a committee as that, but a committee which should visit the colonies, inspect the slave-markets, and contemplate slavery in its naked deformity. This was the only way, he was convinced, in which their Lordships could arrive at a correct understanding of the subject; and, for his own part, he cheerfully offered his services to go as one of such a committee.

AMENDMENTS IN LAW PROCEEDINGS.] Lord *Wynford* said, that he rose, pursuant to the notice he had before given, to move for leave to bring in a bill to lessen expense, and to prevent delay, in the proceedings of the Courts of Law in Westminster-hall. Notwithstanding the acknowledged excellence of the general body of our laws, there could be no doubt, he apprehended, that some defects existed in them. Indeed, this fact was sufficiently proved by the commissions which had been appointed by the late King, to inquire into the practice and proceedings of our superior Courts of Law, and into the state of the law of real property, with a view of suggesting such improvements in both as should appear necessary to the commissioners. That the commissioners appointed to inquire into the proceedings and practice of the superior Courts of Law had done their duty, there certainly could be no doubt; and he need hardly remind their Lordships that four out of these five commissioners had been advanced to the bench. He was quite sensible that, when he differed from such men as these, it became him to proceed with the utmost caution. He could assure their Lordships he should so proceed, and that if he proposed to go a little farther than the commissioners had gone, his steps should be taken cautiously, not only on account of the character of those from whom he differed, but because he was aware that no innovation should be attempted without the greatest deliberation and care. He had no inclination to press their Lordships to come to an early decision upon the bill which he proposed to introduce. He desired to bring it in immediately, merely in order that it might be printed and circulated among the legal profession, whose opinions and suggestions with regard to the provisions of it he was anxious to obtain. He should propose that the bill should be read a second time before their Lordships adjourned for the recess, but it was not his intention to have it committed until after Christmas. By this course the object he had in view would be attained, and their Lordships would have ample time for considering the provisions of the measure. With these observations, he would proceed to detail, shortly, to their Lordships the nature of the bill which, with their permission he intended to bring in. He had already stated, that the object of the bill would be to lessen the expense of, and to prevent delay in, the proceedings of Courts of Law in Westminster-hall. The two great causes of expense in the Courts of Law were the defective state of the pleadings, and the mode of taking evidence. And first with regard to the pleadings. It had been said by the ancestor of a noble Lord then present, that the science of special pleading was founded upon principles of good sense and sound logic. This was perfectly true when said of the ancient science of special pleading, because it was calculated to bring the cause to a plain and intelligible point. From the abuses, however, which had been introduced into the science of special pleading, it could no longer be said with truth that it was characterized either by principles of good sense or of sound logic. Indeed, the many forms which had been invented and foisted into the science, constituted perhaps one of the most striking disgraces of the age in which we lived, and were not calculated to give the least information either to the judge who was to try, or to the parties who were concerned in the cause. The old system of special pleading informed the judge of the nature of the cause he was about to try; but under the new system, a judge frequently went into court having no more knowledge of the cause than the crier of the court had. The multiplication of courts could serve no other purpose than that of creating confusion, and hence in a great measure the delay and the expense which were so frequently and so justly complained of. If, however, he had rightly understood his noble and learned friend (Lord Tenterden) the other night, his noble and learned friend had intimated that it was the intention of the judges to try whether these abuses could not be remedied by some regulations to be agreed upon among themselves. He had heard this with much pleasure, for he was convinced that the subject could not be intrusted to better hands, and he should not therefore attempt any alteration in this part of the law until he had seen what these very learned and very able men should be enabled to effect by the course in contemplation. Leaving this part of the subject, therefore, he would pass on to the next cause of expense and delay in our Courts of Law,—which was, as he had before stated, the defects in the law of evidence, or, in other words, the number of witnesses which it was always possible, and sometimes necessary, to bring into court. It constantly happened, that an immense number of witnesses were called to prove facts which might have been altogether omitted in the trial, because they were not material to the decision of the cause. There was, as it appeared to him, only one way of preventing this evil, the worst consequence of which was not the great and unnecessary expense to which the parties were put,—but, as it caused a great deal of swearing, it caused also, he was afraid, a great deal of perjury. The only way in which he thought this evil could be prevented was, to have recourse to examinations upon interrogatories. In this, following the recommendations which had been made by the commissioners, he proposed to make parties submit to be examined on interrogatories, by which means the facts to be tried would be fairly brought under the knowledge of the court, and of the parties concerned in the cause. He felt convinced, that if the two parties to a cause were made perfectly acquainted with the facts to be tried, and with the evidence to be adduced, much expense would be spared: for there could be no hope of evasion, and a man who had a case which was manifestly unsustainable against the evidence of his adversary, would be advised not to proceed to trial. He was sure that, by this course, one-fourth of the present expense could be saved, and that the number of causes would be diminished in the same proportion. He knew it had been said, that to lessen the expense of legal proceedings, or, in other words, to make law cheap, would be productive of evil, and not of good. He could not concur in this sentiment. He admitted that to make law cheap would have a tendency to increase litigation, and he was not prepared to deny that litigation commonly produced angry feelings between man and man. While he made these admissions, however, he must say that he thought the great expense of legal proceedings was a far greater evil than increasing litigation. He was strongly confirmed in this opinion by the notorious fact that our present expensive system of litigation gave rise to feelings than which none more angry, none more bitter, could be excited by any system which the perverted ingenuity of any man could invent. What, he would beg their Lordships to consider, must be the feelings of that man, who, conscious that he had been injured by an opulent neighbour, and that he had a good cause of action, was restrained from attempting to obtain redress by the fear that the expense of the process would reduce himself and his family to poverty? Must not such a man feel more bitter and more lasting hatred, both against his neighbour and against the Government, who in effect actually denied him justice, than any degree of litigation could possibly excite? While justice could be defeated by formal objections, which was now the case, and while a man might be ruined as well as lose a just cause, they tolerated evils, allow him to say, far greater than any that could arise from the prosecution of any number of cases which could be attended with no injurious consequences to the parties. So much, then, with regard to the objection, that by admitting examination on interrogatories, they would lessen the expense of legal proceedings, and so increase litigation. Another objection which had been made to the proposal of examining parties on interrogatories was, that by disclosing the case, they would open the door to perjury. This he positively denied, and he appealed to every man who had had experience in the matter to say whether his experience did not tell him that the contrary would be the fact,—whether he had not invariably found, that causes which were best known, had always been the causes which were most satisfactorily decided. But further, it had been objected that it was not proper to put the parties to examination upon oath. This, however, could be,—nay, was—done every day under the existing law, and that objection therefore was not entitled to much weight. It was asked, would you put the party on his oath, in order to make him disclose the circumstances of his case? He answered yes; for that such a course would be beneficial; and if its novelty was made an objection, he reminded those who made the objection that this might be done already. A party who had a claim against another, but possessed no means of proving it, might go into the Court of Chancery and get the testimony of the defendant in support of his claim; at least by filing a Bill against him he could compel him to answer upon oath, but he must go there and do this at an expense of 200*l.*; whereas, if he were permitted to go to the Courts of Common Law for the same advantage, he might do it at the expense of a smaller number of shillings. The only difference, therefore, between the present practice and that which he proposed, was as to the price at which the advantage should be obtained. With respect to the place, he thought there could be no doubt that the Court of Common Law was the best place for a plaintiff to go to for such a purpose. An examination on written interrogatories was always insufficient. He had heard that a noble and learned Earl, not then present, had once said, that he must be a bad drawer of an answer if he was not able to get rid of the effect of the questions in chief. In such a case the answer was not that of the parties, but of the parties, the agents, and the Counsel. Here it was, that to a certain extent he departed from the recommendation of the Commissioners, who said, that these interrogatories must be either written or oral. In his opinion they ought always to be oral. The Commissioners then said, that they did not recommend questions to be allowed, other than those which had been previously put upon paper. To that restriction he was opposed, for he knew, from the experience of his professional life, that the answer to one question often suggested another, which might never have been necessary but for the mode in which the first was answered. He should, therefore, recommend that all questions the Counsel might think necessary should be put, and that the questions and answers so put should be entered on the proceedings, and returned to the Court after the examination had been closed. He agreed with those who thought that questions which the Court might deem improper should not be allowed to be put, and he should, therefore, propose to reserve to the Court the power of expunging any questions or answers which in their judgment they should deem improper. He recommended this part of the plan to the attentive consideration of their Lordships, and he had no fear, if it should be adopted, as to the benefit that would result from it. He believed it would produce a diminished expense in law proceedings, and would much facilitate the Trial by Jury. There was one other instance he might have mentioned, in which a party was subjected to examination. He alluded to the case of a bankrupt, who was always examined by the Commissioners, not on interrogatories, but by a *viva voce* examination. The same rules of justice ought to be applicable in all cases. If it was not fit that a plaintiff or defendant should be examined, it was not fit that a bankrupt should be subjected to examination. Unless their Lordships could show some distinction between the cases to which he had alluded, he thought they would agree with him that his plan ought to be adopted, or that the power now possessed by Commissioners of Bankrupts ought to be taken away. If he stopped there, he thought he should have shown that the Bill he proposed possessed abundant advantages to recommend it to their notice. So far as he had hitherto gone, his object had been to render trials cheap and easy, and he humbly conceived that if he were to stop here, he should have made out a sufficient case to warrant their Lordships in acceding to his proposition. But this was not the extent of his measure: with the permission of their Lordships, he intended to go further, always with the view of lessening the expense, and abridging the delay, of legal proceedings. It would probably be in the recollection of many of their Lordships, that an Act was lately passed, of which the object was, to get rid of sham Writs of Error. Much good had doubtless been effected by this Act, but it had evils which were not attended to by the framers of the measure. Before the passing of that Act a party could put his adversary to great expense, and could effect great delay in the final adjudication of a case, by resorting to the vexatious proceedings which sham Writs of Error left open to him. Under the existing law the same party who could no longer have recourse to a sham Writ of Error, proceeded to the very last stage of the trial. This party might be totally destitute of all means of defraying the costs of the action when decided against him, and his unfortunate, though successful adversary, would be fixed with the payment of the costs. Now this was not advantageous to the one party, and it was most grievous to the other party. He proposed, therefore, to alter this system, and to remedy the evil it carried with it. In doing this, he hoped it would not be considered that he proposed to vest too much power in the Judges. He confessed, that in his opinion, the Judges might be trusted with the greatest extent of power which it was safe to commit to any men, but it might be that he was wrong in this, and that he was prejudiced in favour of the Judges by having been so long one of them. However, it was no great power which he now proposed that they should be invested with. His proposal was this,—namely, that when the Judges should see, upon the face of the examinations, that a party had no cause of action, or no defence to an action, the cause should not proceed to trial unless such party gave security for the costs which would be incurred thereby. He need hardly observe, that he did not propose that any such power should be exercised by a Judge when facts were in dispute. In such a case, a Judge and Jury only could decide, and far be it from him to propose that any one else should pronounce in such a case. This power would be exercised only in cases when certain facts were admitted, and upon the face of which admissions it was manifest, either that the one party had no cause of action, or that the other party had no defence. In either case it was only just to the other party that he should be secured against the payment of those costs which, when the adjudication of the case was made, would and ought to fall upon the unsuccessful party. Thus their Lordships would see that no man would be prevented by his proposition from carrying a cause as far as he chose to carry it; that was to say, as far as the process of the law, as it now stood, would allow him to carry it. His proposition merely went to this—namely, that every man resolved upon such a course should give security that no other man should suffer by it. This was one of the occurrences to which he had alluded, when he told their Lordships that there were evils under the existing system far worse than any which had been foreboded from cheap law. The beneficial results of the power with which he thus proposed to invest Judges would be most felt, as their Lordships, he was sure, would see, in cases where there was not a single fact in doubt. These it was manifestly absurd to send to a Jury; and it was in all respects most desirable that such cases should be decided by the Judge. To the Judges, therefore, he proposed to give this power,—allowing, however, at the same time, either of the parties to put such a case upon record. The Bill would empower the Judges at once to determine any question of law raised in a case, reserving leave to either party if he thought proper, to have it solemnly considered. At present the Judges were often obliged to go through the labour of a trial, and the parties to submit to the expense, when not one question of fact was in dispute, and when the Court did not know the real point at issue. In the Court of Common Pleas there was a case of that sort. It was an action brought against a learned gentleman Mr. Jekyll in his character of executor, and the action was in the form of money had and received. The plea was *non assumpsit.* He would state the fact to their Lordships, and they would then see that neither by the declaration nor by the pleadings could the Court know the real point to be decided. The defendant was the executor of Sir C. Bunbury, who died seized of a copyhold estate. That estate had formerly belonged to one person—from him it descended to two others, and through them to fourteen other persons. It was the custom of the manor of which that estate was part, that at the death of the tenant a heriot of the best beast should be paid to the Lord. The question at issue between the parties was, whether the executors should pay the fourteen heriots in respect of the fourteen parcels into which the estate had been once divided, or only one in respect of the possession of the last tenant in whom all the titles of all the preceding owners had been vested. All the facts were admitted in that case, but for the want of the power he now proposed to give the Judges—witnesses were summoned from Wiltshire and Norfolk, in which last county the estate was situated, in order to prove facts that were not at all in dispute. In consequence of this, great expense was incurred, and great delay occasioned. If the Bill now proposed should be adopted, it would appear what was the question in the Cause, and the Court would order it to be put into the shape of a special case or a special verdict, and the Cause would be over in fewer months than it now occupied years. By the adoption of these means both parties would be saved in costs. He now came to another part of the subject. As he had taken away the means of delay, he should propose something as a security for the defendant in a certain class of cases not hitherto considered. It was known, that when a debt was due, or when the title to premises could not be defended by the tenant in possession, immediate payment of the debt, or still more immediate surrender of the premises, might be attended with ruinous consequences. With a view to remedy that evil, he should propose a clause, that when a party came into Court, and acknowledged that he had no answer to make to the plaintiff's demand, a power should be vested in the Court to give time to the defendant, not exceeding three months, for the purpose of enabling him to deliver up the premises, provided that, in the mean time he gave security for the due execution of the judgment of the Court. He did this, in order to protect a man who might be engaged in a profitable trade, and who might be ruined if called on instantly to pay a very large sum, or to deliver up premises in which he was carrying on his business. It was to obtain such an advantage that sham and dilatory pleas and Writs of Error were now frequently resorted to. By the present practice, any man might have that advantage. Under that which he proposed, none would enjoy it but those who acted honestly and fairly. There was one other thing to which he wished to allude. The law of England differed from that of every other country in one respect. He could not but think the other countries were right and we were wrong, because we alone differed from all the rest, particularly as to the point he was about to mention, and he was of that opinion, especially, because this difference did not turn on any peculiarity in our institutions, in the tenure of our property, or in our state of society. By the law of England, the man who built on a property of which he was in possession, might afterwards, if turned out by a plaintiff who recovered in a possessory action, be compelled to deliver up the land with all the buildings upon it, and to yield for the plaintiff's permanent advantage all the improvements he had made. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack knew that that was not the law of Scotland, nor was it the Roman law, nor was it the law of France, of Holland or of Spain, nor indeed of any other country but England. In all the countries he had named, when a party honestly believed that he was the legal owner of the land of which he was in possession, and in that belief made improvements upon it, though another might afterwards prove a stronger title to the land, he was not obliged to give it up till he had been paid the value of the improvements, or till he had been allowed time and the means to take them away, leaving the estate, however, in as good a condition as before he built upon it. That, as their Lordships knew, was not only the law of other countries, but it was a rule founded upon a principle of morals recognized alike by the Heathen and the Christian. In that respect, our law ought to be altered, and where the property was recovered from a man who, when in possession, had reason to think that he was the *bona fide* owner of it, and in that belief had expended money upon it, the Court should have authority to suspend the issuing of the writ of execution till he had taken away the improvements he had made, or till the other party, who had been enriched by the improvements, had paid him the value. He did not hope to satisfy their Lordships that all he proposed ought to be adopted; but if the past pursuits of his professional life enabled him in any manner now to improve the administration of justice, he should be amply recompensed for his labour. He re-stated, that he did not mean to press their Lordships to a decision now, but should propose that the Bill be read a first time this night, and a second time before the adjournment, and then the Bill need not be committed till after the Christmas recess, and during that period (though he was sorry that some of the Judges would be occupied with more important labours), he had no doubt that all of their Lordships who were at liberty would most willingly afford him their assistance. He moved that the Bill be read a first time.

Lord *Tenterden* said, that it was not his intention to advert on the present occasion to the different topics to which his noble and learned friend had alluded in his able and eloquent speech, much less to meet them with any opposition. He should give his best attention to this Bill, or to such parts of it as in his judgment he should consider to be improvements in the existing law. He only rose on the present occasion to prevent it from being supposed that he assented to the Bill by letting it pass by in silence. There were some points in the Bill with which at present he could not agree: but he would take time to consider it more maturely before he gave a decisive opinion upon it.

The *Lord Chancellor* concurred with what had fallen from the Lord Chief Justice on this very important proposition of his noble and learned friend. Undoubtedly, his noble and learned friend had gone over a large space; and the changes which his Bill would make in the law were neither slight nor unimportant. He therefore entirely agreed with the Lord Chief Justice in thinking that their Lordships should have full time for considering the Bill now proposed to them. The last point to which his noble and learned friend had alluded in his speech was the most difficult of all—he meant the plan for enabling parties to recover the value of the improvements which they had made on lands, in cases where they had believed themselves *bona fide* to be the rightful possessors. The difficulty in all such cases was as to the *bona fide* possession; and the Civil Law did not merely give to the *bona fide* possessor the value of his improvements—it also gave him the *fructus prædii*. His noble and learned friend might perhaps intend to interfere with the action for the recovery of mesne profits.

Lord *Wynford* said, that he had no intention of the sort.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that his noble and learned friend was aware that the principles of the Civil Law, as they affected this question, went much further than he proposed. He would not, however, then discuss that or any other points likely to come into dispute. His Lordship accordingly concluded by repeating his conviction, that time should be allowed to weigh the changes which this Bill would make in the law, especially as some of its clauses were novelties, and unlike the majority of them, which were recommendations from the Commissioners.

Lord *Wynford* said, he should consider corn sown by the party against whom the judgment was given, as a species of emblements, and should leave the party recovering the lands to take it upon such terms as the Judges might think proper.

Bill read a first time, and to be printed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, Nov. 30.

MINUTES.] A new Writ was ordered for the County of Montgomery, in the room of the right hon. C. W. WYNN, who had accepted the office of Secretary at War.

Seventeen Members obtained leave of absence, on account of the disturbances in the Counties with which they are connected.

The sitting Members for Dartmouth, JOHN BASTARD, Esq. and A. H. HOLDSWORTH, Esq.:—For Marlborough, T. H. E. ESTCOURT, Esq. and W. J. BANKES, Esq.:—And for Calne, Sir JAMES MACDONALD, Bart. and T. B. MACAULAY, Esq. were declared, by reports of Election Committees, duly elected.

Bills. The five Bills introduced into the House of Lords, by Lord TENTERDEN, viz. the Judgment and Execution, the Interpleader, the Witnesses Examinations, the Prohibition and Mandamus, and the Arbitration Bills, were brought down from the House of Lords, and severally read a first time. The Consolidated Fund, and the Colonial Acts Validity Bill, were read a second time.

STAMFORD ELECTION PETITION.] The *Speaker* having called the attention of the House to the Petition of the Electors of Stamford, respecting the late election for that Borough,

Mr. *Tennyson* presented a Petition from those electors, praying for an extension of the time for entering into recognizances. He moved that the prayer of the petition be granted.

Mr. *Maberly* opposed that petition. He said, that his hon. friend (Mr. Tennyson), who was interested in the petition, being himself a lawyer, and a Member of that House, could not plead ignorance of the law or of the forms of Parliament in excuse for the irregularity of his petition. Besides, the House had decided in the negative upon a similar petition, respecting the election for Marlow, in the year 1816.

Sir *C. Wetherell* said, that a special Act of Parliament had been passed to regulate the proceedings on those Election Petitions. The persons then applying to the House for further indulgence had neglected the provisions of that Act, and he thought the House ought not to allow them the extension of time which they required.

Mr. *Tennyson*, in moving that the Petition be laid upon the Table, observed, that the House had interfered in six similar cases before—that it had power to do so, and that it ought to enlarge the time for entering into those recognizances, as prayed by the Petitioners. The Borough, he contended, was not a rotten Borough, and if the petition went before a committee, he had not the slightest doubt that such committee would stigmatise, not the electors of the Borough, but other parties who had endeavoured to stigmatise those electors. He thought it would be more becoming in the House to be governed by the spirit and general tenor of the Act, than by a trumpery clause of three lines in an Act of Parliament. The House was bound in every case to administer justice, and ought not to be stopped when it had power to give relief. He wished, before he sat down, to learn the opinion of the Chair on the clause under which the enlargement of time was sought.

The *Speaker* disclaimed any intention of wishing to influence the decision of the House on that or any other question. The clause which they had then to consider was the 6th. It required, that on the day on which the petition was presented, or the next day the petitioners should deliver in the names with the additions and places of residence of the persons whom they proposed as sureties, and that the same be entered in a book kept open in the office appointed for that purpose. When the subject of the present petition came before him, he inquired if that preliminary proceeding had been complied with, and being answered in the negative, he replied that, unless better instructed by the House, he should not feel himself at liberty to enlarge the time; at least such was his construction of the Statute.

Mr. *Tennyson* said, that the point on which he wished to learn the opinion of the Speaker was, whether or not the House had power to interfere. If the facts were verified on oath, could the House dispense with the prescribed regulation?

The *Speaker* said, the conduct he had pursued in the matter fully indicated his opinion.

Mr. *Tennyson* would still maintain, that the House was not excluded from entertaining that question.

Mr. *Maberly* observed, that the House could have no power to violate an Act of Parliament.

Sir *E. B. Sugden* considered the Act to be imperative upon the House.

Sir *John Bourke* observed, that the statements of the petition ought to be verified by affidavits.

The *Speaker* said, there could not well be any affidavits put in respecting the construction of an Act of Parliament.

Mr. *Spring Rice* thought that his hon. friend would be better advised in not making any motion to enlarge the time, especially after what had fallen from the Chair.

Motion withdrawn.

EXPENSE OF THE NEW POLICE.] Mr. *Wilks*, in moving for certain Returns of which he had given notice respecting the Metropolitan Police Force, adverted to the willingness expressed by a right hon. Baronet below him to agree to the appointment of a committee to inquire into the character and organization of that force, a proceeding which, he had no doubt, would be attended with results highly creditable to that body; for he thought them in many respects well calculated to answer the purpose for which they had been formed, though admitting of considerable improvement. The chief and best founded objection to them was the expense. This expense amounted in many parishes to an increase of 150 per cent on the old rate, in others to 300 per cent, and in some, even to much more. He thought this was a subject which required some investigation, and in order to pave the way towards a thorough knowledge of the comparative cost of the two systems, he begged leave to move for a return of the amount paid in each parish, for the equipment and support of the new police, and the amount of rental on which that amount is raised, together with a return of the sums paid by each parish in the year before the organization of the new police; stating the number of watchmen and police constables employed, and the amount of rental on which such sum was raised.

Mr. *George Lamb* repeated the statement made by Sir R. Peel, on a former evening, that the returns connected with the payments on account of the new police were, according to the provisions of the Act of Parliament, to be laid before the House after the Christmas Recess. For that reason he did not think the hon. Member should press the first part of his motion; but he had no objection to the second part, because he was anxious, in common with all others, that the new system of police should be fully inquired into, and its merits fully recognized.

Sir *Robert Peel* was also desirous that the expenses of the new police should be fully ascertained; and he hoped that the return moved for by the hon. Member would be made as comprehensive as possible, in order to afford a fair comparison between the cost and efficiency of the new day and night police and the old system of parochial watch. He believed it was quite true that some of the parishes paid as much above what they formerly paid as the hon. Gentleman stated, but it was because they did not pay a shilling before, and trusted solely to the watch provided by their neighbours.

Mr. *Hume* approved of the system of police, but felt that the expense required reduction. In one parish the sum paid for watching was raised from 1,450*l.* to 5,500*l.* a year.

Motion agreed to.

On the Motion that the Consolidated Fund Bill be committed,

POSTMASTER-GENERAL (IRELAND.)] Mr. *Hume* asked if it was the intention of Government to fill up the vacancy created by the retirement of the noble Earl who lately held the sinecure office of Postmaster-general of Ireland?

Mr. *Spring Rice* was happy to say, that Government had determined not to make any new appointment of that description in Ireland.

Mr. *Goulburn*, in justice to those Gentlemen who were connected with the late the Administration, felt himself called on to say, that they had determined not to renew the office alluded to, on the retirement of its present possessor, and they had also abstained, in prosecution of the same views, from filling the vacancy created by the retirement of the other noble Lord who was joint possessor of the office.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, Dec. 1.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. Against Slavery, by Lord WHARNCLIFFE, from the Inhabitants of Sheffield; and from various other places by his Lordship, the Archbishop of CANTERBURY, the Marquis of BUTE, and the Marquis of CLEVELAND. By Lord WHARNCLIFFE, from the Ship-owners and other Inhabitants of the Port of Goole, in Yorkshire, for a repeal of the Duty on Seaborne Coals. And from the Members of the Guildry of Perth, praying for Parliamentary Reform, especially in the election of Representatives for Scotch Burghs.

SLAVERY.] Earl *Grosvenor*, in presenting some Petitions on this subject, expressed a wish, that, whenever the question was brought forward, it would be by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. He urged the necessity of as speedy a consideration of the question as was consistent with the important duties of the new Administration, with a view to the abolition of Slavery. He knew that it could not be brought forward before the recess, but immediately afterwards he hoped that it would be submitted to their Lordships' consideration; and that measures would then be taken to give liberty to the unfortunate slave.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, Dec. 2.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By Earl GREY, from Bridlington, and by Lord CALTHORPE, from Poole, for the repeal of the Duty on Sea-borne Coals. By Earl GREY, for a more equitable distribution than at present of the Funds destined to promote Education in Ireland, from Hilnarvel; from the Burghs of Arbroath and Montrose by the same noble Earl, and from the City of Cork, for a Reform in

Parliament. For the abolition of Slavery, by Earls GREY and CARNARVON, the Bishops of LONDON and GLOUCESTER, and Lords CALTHORPE and MELBOURNE, a great number from different Dissenting Congregations in all parts of the Country.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF EDUCATION IN IRELAND.] The Bishop of *Norwich* said, that he had a Petition to present from Roman Catholic inhabitants of the county of Mayo. The petitioners complained, and, in his opinion, very justly complained, that notwithstanding the great measure of relief, so consistent with principles of good policy and of Christian charity, they were still deprived, in consequence of the religion they professed, of the benefit of the parliamentary grants destined for the education of the poor in Ireland. They stated that they could not conscientiously send their children to be educated at the schools of the Kildare-street Society, and they therefore prayed for a more equitable distribution of the national funds.

Lord *Carbery* thought the attacks that were frequently made on the Kildare-street Society most unfair, for that society had diffused the benefits of education in different parts of the country, and would have been more extensively useful but for the Catholic priesthood. Parents were disposed to send their children to school, but the priests would not allow them. He had heard that they had refused spiritual consolation to their followers when these latter persisted in sending their children to the schools of the Society, and he knew that their influence had been noxious to a Society, to the utility of which he desired to bear his testimony.

The Bishop of *Norwich* thought the noble Lord's observations confirmatory of the statement in the petition, and an additional proof that the national funds should not be exclusively confined to one Society to which the great majority of the people were hostile.

Petition to lie on the Table.

COURTS OF LOCAL JURISDICTION.] The *Lord Chancellor* said, that in rising to call the attention of their Lordships to a subject of the highest possible importance, involving in no inconsiderable degree the welfare of the country, he could not help feeling that he owed to their Lordships a very ample apology for having undertaken a matter of so great moment, as well as of so vast extent, considering how short a period had elapsed since he had received the honour of a seat in that House, and more especially considering the circumstances under which he felt himself called upon to introduce the subject to their Lordships' notice. On any other occasion, and under any other circumstances, the feelings which dictated this apology would have prevented him from committing the trespass which, he unfeignedly believed, demanded apology; but circumstances which he was about to state to their Lordships would at once explain the motives which had actuated him in this proceeding, and furnish, at least he humbly hoped they would furnish, a justification of the proceeding, although, at the same time, in troubling their Lordships with the statement of those circumstances, he was perhaps incurring the blame of additional impropriety by obtruding on their Lordships matters in a great measure personal to himself. But it was absolutely necessary that he should state those circumstances to their Lordships, or he should be precluded from all grounds of apology. On looking at the Journals of the other House of Parliament, their Lordships wouldfind that at a very early period in the present Session of Parliament, —when he enjoyed the high honour of a seat in the House of Commons,—he had obtained leave from that House to bring in a bill of the same nature,—not precisely and in every feature, but essentially of the same nature—with that which he had now to ask the permission of their Lordships to carry forward in this House. Before there had occurred to him the opportunity of availing himself of the permission of the other House, he had been removed to a seat in this House, and thus the progress of the bill was suspended. By a reference to the Journals of the other House, their Lordships would see that in bringing in the Bill two coadjutors had been joined with him. One of these (Mr. Denman) had now been raised to an important office, of which the duties rendered it altogether unreasonable to expect that he should encumber himself with the labour of carrying this measure through the House of Commons; and for his other coadjutor, that Gentleman (Mr. M. A. Taylor), however intelligent, and however willing to undertake the task, was nevertheless not a professional man; and besides the disinclination which he (the Lord Chancellor) felt to impose upon his friend, labours which, as he ought, so he had always intended, to bear himself,—besides this disinclination, he said,—he held it to be quite impossible that any Gentleman who had not practical experience of the proceedings in our Courts of Justice could prosecute with any thing like a fair chance of success such a measure as that which the House of Commons had given him leave to bring in. For these reasons, therefore,—because it had become impossible for him to avail himself of the permission which the other House had given him, and because it was hardly possible that his coadjutors could avail themselves of that permission for him,—he had resolved to ask that support of their Lordships which the other House had not hesitated to grant him, and with their leave to bring forward the Bill here. The measure was, perhaps, one of such a nature, that it did not belong more to the cognizance of the one House than to the cognizance of the other; or, if it did, probably it belonged more especially to the cognizance of their Lordships. Indeed, if he were asked which branch of the Legislature was the more proper to decide concerning such measures he thought he might say, without any violence to the facts, or without going in search of any fanciful distinction, that this House, which was invested with the highest functions of a judicial character, was the most proper to originate a bill to effect what he was sure would be a great alteration, and he hoped a great improvement, in the administration of justice. In this House, too, he had, what was invaluable to any one who attempted to effect legal Reforms, the benefit of the assistance—assistance which, he was persuaded, would be cheerfully contributed—of those noble and learned persons who had the honour of seats here, whose lives had been passed in the study and in the administration of the laws; many of whom, to their immortal honour, had suggested and carried into effect most important and most beneficial legal improvements; and who, to those advantages, to this learning, to this experience, and to this manifestation of a desire to effect improvements where improvements could be effected, joined what was equally favourable to the end he had in view—full and ample leisure for deliberation. Encouraged by the hope, the confident hope, of aid from those noble and learned persons,—encouraged, too, by his own strong persuasion of the paramount importance of the subject,—and also by his personal professional knowledge of the extent and the grievousness of those defects which he sought by this measure to remove,—thus encouraged, he threw himself upon the indulgence of their Lordships, while he stated, which he should do as shortly and as distinctly as possible, the nature of the evils which had induced him to bring forward this measure, and the nature of the remedies which he proposed to apply to those evils. Before, however, he proceeded farther, he felt it due to his noble friends on the bench opposite [the Ministerial bench] to state to their Lordships, entreating them to bear it in mind, that what he was about to suggest came from himself, and from himself only, as an individual member of that House; that he had had no opportunity to confer with or to consult his noble friends and colleagues in office, upon this subject; and that, therefore, the measure which he was now about to bring under the notice of their Lordships, was a measure proposed by him, as an individual peer, in his individual capacity, and so submitted by him to his peers in that House for their sanction, and for the sanction of the other branch of the Legislature; but not at all a measure either proceeding from, or having in any degree hitherto received the sanction of, the Government. To the Government he addressed the measure, as he addressed it to the rest of their Lordships, and for the support of the Government he was no doubt anxious,—as all their Lordships who had any measure to propose must be anxious, for with that support he might reasonably hope that others would be induced to lend a more favourable ear to the proposition he was about to submit to their Lordships; but he owed it to his noble friends to say, that the proposition proceeded from himself alone, and that it had not the sanction of their authority,—as, indeed, it could not have,—for he repeated, that he had not had an opportunity of consulting his noble friends upon the subject. With these observations he proceeded at once to explain the nature of the proposition which he had now to make to their Lordships. He believed that those of their Lordships who were conversant with the proceedings of our Courts of Law,—where some of them had appeared in a professional capacity, and others in the less fortunate one of suitors,—would have at least an imperfect, and perhaps dearly-bought, knowledge of some of the particulars, which it would therefore be only necessary for him briefly to remind their Lordships of, as the beginning and foundation of his proposition, which was, that there were many things in the mode of attaining remedy for wrongs inflicted,—that there were many things in the prosecution of rights withheld,—that there were, in a word, many things in the proceedings of the judicature of the country, which required—he would not say to be swept away with a rude, unsparing hand, but—to be considered with the view of removing them, and of establishing in their stead a cheaper, a shorter, an easier, a more convenient, and a less vexatious mode of acquiring a remedy for wrongs, and of prosecuting rights. He would not detain their Lordships with the hackneyed subjects,—hackneyed, he feared, because cruelly and generally felt,—of the expense and delay of legal proceedings; but, waiving particulars, he would only remind their Lordships of one or two facts connected with the proceedings in our Courts of judicature, which facts alone, he apprehended, would warrant the statement he had made, that there were many parts of those institutions that called for consideration. Their Lordships were aware that by a most salutary provision of the Constitution, all the law proceedings of this land, except where matters of a very trifling value were concerned, must begin and centre in the King's Courts in Westminster-hall. Now from this provision there resulted many great and important advantages, and above all the benefits which arose from it was this invaluable good,—namely, that in consequence of this general control and supervision of the King's Courts at Westminster, it was absolutely impossible that any discrepancies could arise in the system of the administration and practice of the law in various parts of the country, because in all, the system was assimilated, and its uniformity preserved, by the general control of the high courts at Westminster. But together with these advantages, which no man could value higher than he did, and which he should show could be maintained and secured, if not better, at least as well, by other means,—together with these advantages, he said, many evils of a most serious character were combined, and which had arisen from this provision:—As all actions must be tried on records issuing out of the King's Courts at Westminster, it followed of necessity that they could be tried only twice a year, that was to say, when the King's Justices went their circuits: and the consequence of this was, that in whatever part of the county the suits might have arisen,—at whatever distance from the assize town,—and at whatever period during the six months, at the end of which the Judges came,—all must resort to the assize town, and to no other place, for there only did the Judges sit, and they sat there only at stated intervals,—namely, for short periods at the end of every six months. It might happen that the cases were of great importance, involving vast interests, and the suitors might be persons of extensive means. In such cases delay and distance might be of little moment: the distance to be travelled would be nothing to such parties, and the delay that intervened between the time at which the cause was ripe for hearing, and the time at which it could be heard, would not be considered when the stake was large. In such cases, therefore, the delay and the distance might be passed over as quantities too insignificant to be taken into the calculation, because they were nothing in comparison to the result, and because they bore so small a proportion to the interest at stake. But it was far otherwise where the interest at stake was small. To persons in the middling and humble classes of life, who had no large property, out of which to defray the charges of a suit,—who had no time to spare from the occupations by which they earned their livelihood, and whose suits were not of such a nature as to require a long period in which to prepare them for trial,—to such persons a delay of six months in the adjudication of their cause, and the consequent expenses of this delay, as well as the costs of trial at a distance from their homes, were matters of the most serious—he had almost said, of ruinous importance; nor was there, nor could there be, any reason for such delay and expense, except that the law, as it now stood, made it necessary that the cause should be tried at the Assizes, and not before, and at the assize town, and nowhere else. Now, before he called their Lordships attention to the proportion between small and great causes,—that was to say, between causes where the interest at stake was small, and where it was large,—he would stop for a moment to remind some of their Lordships, and, it might be, to inform others, of the amount of the costs incurred in the trial of causes under the present system. He would pass over those costs which must necessarily arise from delay: he would pass over the loss which the same delay must also necessarily produce in the case of at least a certain class of suitors; and he would say nothing about the wounded feelings of men who had suffered the infliction of wrongs, or who beheld their rights unjustly withheld from them; he would pass over these considerations, although delay in the one case must be a cruel aggravation of the injuries under which a man smarted, and although the withholding a sum of money for five or six months might be absolute ruin to many. These evils must be obvious to their Lordships upon the slightest glance at the system, and he was sure that he need not dwell then upon the propriety of removing them. He would, however, show to their Lordships how, practically, the expense of this mode of trying suits, putting the delay out of the question, weighed most heavily upon the suitors. It was from the expenses of witnesses whom they were obliged to bring into Court, and from their own personal expenses when fetched from their own homes to the assize town, that much of the cost arose. Notwithstanding the many wise and salutary regulations which the learned Judges had made, it was still impossible, where the county was of any great extent, and where the cause-paper was at all crowded, so to arrange the business as to preclude the necessity of suitors, their attornies, their agents, and their witnesses, passing several days at the assize town. At York, he had known the Assizes frequently last for a fortnight; and, on one occasion, he had known them last for three weeks all but a day. The excellent regulations made by Mr. Justice Bayley had indeed prevented men being kept there for two or three weeks; but none of those regulations had been found sufficient to prevent the attendance of some for several days, or to prevent that attendance being extremely burthensome to all. He need hardly remind their Lordships of how much importance a delay of only ten days must be to an unfortunate suitor of slender means. Such a man would of course have to maintain himself at the assize town during that period, and to maintain also such of his family as might have accompanied him there; but, as it might not be absolutely necessary that the suitor should bring any of his family thither, such expense might be put out of the calculation. The suitor's personal expenses, however, which in an assize town, and at such time, could not be trifling, must be defrayed. His attorney, too, must be there, and an attorney, if he recollected rightly, was allowed to charge his client two guineas a day for his expenses; that was to say, two guineas a day if he had not more than one cause, and if he had more than one, then he might charge one guinea a day,—being allowed to recover also another guinea from the other party, if he should succeed in defeating him. This was the charge allowed in the Master's office, if his recollection were correct; but then their Lordships were perhaps aware that the attorney received more than what the Master allowed him from his client. Next came the expenses of the witnesses. The witnesses, almost of necessity, were brought from the same part of the county with the suitor: at least it generally happened that a man's witnesses were his neighbours, — persons living near him, who knew him, and who had had dealings with him. How much then did a man's witnesses cost him? Why, by the regulations of the office, witnesses, he believed, were divided into three classes: first, professional men—say physicians, surveyors, artists, and so forth; secondly, master workmen; thirdly, journeymen labourers. The first class were allowed two guineas a day for their expenses; the second, 15*s.* a day; the third, 5*s.* a day. This was the allowance recognized by the office, but their Lordships must by no means suppose that these sums were all that witnesses obtained from suitors. He could assure their Lordships that he was stating only what was consistent with his own experience, when he said, that clients were always as sensible of the importance of having a witness in good humour, as of having the Court favourably disposed towards them. Nay this was generally considered absolutely necessary, and more especially so when the witness was such an one as did not come to swear to a matter of fact, but to a matter of estimate; and in such cases the witness always had from the suitor a much more ample allowance than the office would give him, considerable as that allowance was. Of such witnesses, also, the number would be generally two or three. Experience, and knowledge, and practice, had shown the necessity of calling more than one professional man, such as physicians, artists, surveyors, and the like, for these would be called by the one party as well as by the other; and oftentimes it happened that great was the discrepancy of opinion among them; nay, even in matters of measurement he had known this to be the case, as though the extent of measured space was a matter of opinion, and not of fact. It was necessary, therefore, to have enough of such evidence: every man, whether counsel or attorney, knew this, and advised accordingly; and hence it happened that a man, to be well prepared, —that was to say, to be in a condition to meet his adversary on equal terms,—must come, if not with a cloud of witnesses, at least with a parcel of witnesses; and these, besides their allowance of two guineas a day, travelled at the rate of 1*s.* 6*d.* a mile. He knew that these details must be very tiresome to their Lordships, and he would trouble them with as few as possible. Their Lordships would see by this statement that 50*l.* or 60*l.* might be very easily expended by a suitor, in the costs of attorney and witnesses at the assize town, and before the cause came on for trial, if the suitor should be detained, as was frequently the case, ten days at the assize town. Now, as he had before observed, if the question at issue was the title to a large freehold estate, or a share in some mercantile concern, amounting to thousands of pounds in value, these charges might be passed over as too insignificant to enter into the calculation; but what would their Lordships say when they heard that the costs might still be the same—might still be 50*l.* or 60*l.* although the whole sum in dispute did not amount to 50*l.*, nay not to 10*l.*? This, however, was the fact; and when he called the attention of their Lordships, as he presently should, to the proportion between causes of small value, and causes of large value, their Lordships would be able to judge of the magnitude of this evil, and would agree, he was sure, with the proposition with which he had started,—viz. that the subject ought to be taken into their most serious consideration. Let him also remind their Lordships, that if a party, after having gone to the large expense of bringing up witnesses, maintaining his attorney, and defraying the costs of the trial, —all which, in many cases, amounted to a far greater sum than that he had mentioned,—let him remind their Lordships, he said, that if a party, after this outlay, received the judgment of the Court in his favour, he could, by the theory of our law, recover the charges he had been put to from the other party; but that, by the melancholy practice of our law, the successful party never recovered the whole from his adversary. All that he could recover was the amount which the master would allow on taxation, and this was seldom more than two-thirds of what the party had actually paid. The party, therefore, though successful, must be out of pocket, on account of costs, to the amount of at least one-third of those costs. He had called this the melancholy practice of our law, but he had called it so only in contradistinction to the theory of the law. He did not mean by that expression to cast any imputation on the provisions of the law in this respect, for those provisions must of necessity continue as they were, as long as men were men. To make the practice of our law, in this respect, consistent with the theory of it, would, under the existing system, be placing in men's hands a most dangerous and destructive engine of oppression; for it would be saying, that there should be no distinction made between the costs which it was reasonable the losing party should defray, and those costs which his adversary might be inclined to make him pay. Their Lordships, he was sure, would readily see what he meant. If a successful party were allowed to recover all his costs, the inevitable consequence would be, that that party, if he were sure to recover against his opponent, would take care to punish the person against whom he had succeeded by multiplying charge upon charge to the utmost of his appetite and ingenuity; and further than this, would not be unwilling to allow his attorney to have his share of plunder, by authorizing him to pursue the same vexatiously expensive course. For these reasons it must be evident that this provision of the law was not to be blamed. But let their Lordships see how this system bore upon causes in which small interests were at stake. Would they tell him whether it was not expedient, and reasonable, and just, to lessen the expense of legal proceedings, which could be effected in no more certain and more effectual way than by bringing justice home to every man's door? He had obtained three bills of costs, with the results only of which he would now trouble their Lordships. The first amounted to 400*l.* and of this, the Master, on taxation, struck off 200*l.*, that was to say, just one-half. The second amounted to 210*l.*, and of this the Master taxed off 70*l.*, or one-third. The last amounted to 60*l.* This was an undefended cause; so that the amount spent in the litigation of an undefended cause was 60*l.*, and of this the Master taxed off one-fourth, 15*l.* Now their Lordships would see, therefore, that in these cases the successful parties had to pay out of their own pockets—in the first case 200*l.*, in the second 70*l.*, and in the third 15*l.* The sums in question in the first case were large; it was an important case, and probably no cost had been spared in getting it ready for trial. In the second case, the sum at issue was somewhat about 100*l.*, so that the unfortunate suitor, after an outlay of 210*l.* in order to recover 100*l.* got at last only 30*l.* In the third case, the sum at issue was 50*l.*, which it cost the party 45*l.* to recover; and he need not remind their Lordships that the costs would have been quite as great if the debt had been only 10*l.* and that also no greater amount of costs could have been recovered against the defendant; consequently, if a poor man had brought this action for 10*l.*, the costs amounting to 60*l.*, and he being allowed to recover only 45*l.*, he would have been 5*l.* the worse for bringing the action, and obtaining a verdict in his favour. And in this last case the party suing would be placed in the most favourable circumstances possible, for the defendant offered to him none of those obstacles which the law placed within his reach, and by which he might have increased the amount of the plaintiff's costs. The cause would have been undefended, and yet the plaintiff would have lost by bringing the action. Now these facts, he thought, showed the necessity of endeavouring to cheapen and to facilitate the access to Courts of Justice for suitors who had causes to try in which the interest at stake was small. He had promised their Lordships that he would show them the proportion between causes of large amount, and of small amount. He would now do so: for they egregiously deceived themselves who supposed that his noble friend, the Lord Chief Justice, clothed with one of the highest legal offices, and placed at the head of the highest Court of legal judicature, was employed in trying cases only in which property to a large amount was at stake,—in which vast and important interests were involved,—in a word, cases which required the interposition of so high a judicial personage. If his Lordship was oftentimes called upon to try causes of vast importance, involving extensive interests, the title to great estates, the right to sums of money of princely amount, still it did happen far more frequently that his Lordship sat to adjudicate litigated claims of the most trifling—nay, often of altogether insignificant amount. Such was the character of by far the greater number of the causes which were brought before his Lordship. He was about to state to their Lordships a fact in illustration of the vast preponderance of small over great causes. This was, perhaps, an extreme case, for in the whole course of his —unfortunately not very short—professional career, he had never heard of one similar to it, and possibly—nay, he dared say it was so—his noble and learned friend (Lord Tenterden), notwithstanding his extensive experience, would be unable to supply a parallel to it. Observing, upon one occasion, at the Assizes in the county palatine of Lancaster, that the verdicts were generally unusually low, he had asked the Prothonotary to make him out a list of the verdicts, and of the amount of them. This was in the Spring of 1826, and he received from the Prothonotary, a gentleman of great intelligence, and whose accuracy might be implicitly relied upon, the amount of the verdicts given in fifty-two causes, which was the whole number of the causes tried. Now, what did their Lordships suppose was the average amount of the verdicts in fifty-two causes, the accumulated litigation of the whole of one half-year in the county palatine of Lancaster, a county containing a population of more than 1,200,000 souls, and of which the vast mercantile dealings were too well known for him to attempt to describe them;—why, the average amount of the verdicts was 14*l.* 15*s.*, that was to say, a trifle under 15*l.*, a sum less than that for which a man by law might be arrested and held to bail. If the real value of these cases had been entered, probably the value of the property in litigation would appear much greater; for three or four of them were actions of ejectment, and in these the verdict was of course only nominal: but generally this was not the nature of the causes; they were, for the most part, verdicts for the full amount of the property claimed, which amount was generally under 15*l.* He had stated to their Lordships, as in fairness he was bound to state, that he believed this to be an extreme case; but if their Lordships would refer to that report of the Law Commissioners to which his noble and learned friend (Lord Wynford) had called the attention of their Lordships, in the very able speech he had made the other night in proposing certain legal reforms, their Lordships would see, that the number of causes in which small interests were involved, greatly preponderated over the number of those in which property to anything like an extensive amount was at stake. From that report he would select a few instances, to which he entreated the attention of their Lordships. It appeared from returns presented to the House of Commons, that in the year 1827, the number of affidavits for debt above 10*l.* filed in the Court of King's Bench, the Court of Common Pleas, and the Court of Exchequer, was 93,375. Of this number not less than 30,000 were filed in cases where the debt was above 10*l.* and under 20*l.*; 34,000 were filed in cases where the debt was above 20*l.* and under 50*l.*: so that two-thirds of the number of affidavits of debt filed in the year 1827, or 64,000 out of 93,000 affidavits, were for sums under 50*l.* If they looked at the number of affidavits filed for sums above 100*l.*,—and he took that sum as a natural limit for those actions which ought not to be removed from the jurisdiction of the superior Courts,—their Lordships would find that they did not exceed 15,000: so that 78,000 out of the 93,000 affidavits filed were for sums under 100*l.* Thus one-sixth of the number of affidavits filed were for sums above 100*l.*, two-thirds of them were for sums under 50*l.*, and five-sixths were for sums under 100*l.* As this was an important feature of the case, and as the proposition which he was going to develope to their Lordships was intended to remedy this grievance, he would endeavour to illustrate it more fully by placing it in another point of view before them. At the London Sittings for 1829, there were tried before his noble and learned friend, the Chief Justice of the King's Bench, 909 cases, of which 184 were for sums above 100*l.*, 319 for sums under 50*l.*, and 406 for sums under 20*l.* At the Sittings for Middlesex, the proportion was nearly the same; and in the two places together more than half the causes tried were under 50*l.*, whilst more than a third of them were under the trifling sum of 20*l.* The noble and learned Lord then proceeded to read similar returns respecting the number of cases tried at the Spring Assizes in Yorkshire, Oxfordshire, and some other counties, specifying the proportion which existed between the number of the actions brought for sums above 10*l.*, under 20*l.*, under 50*l.*, and above 100*l.* respectively; and when he had read them through, proceeded to observe, that he thought that he had now sufficiently demonstrated the proposition, with which he had set out, at the commencement of his address to their Lordships,—namely, that a large proportion of the litigation of the country, as it is at present conducted in the highest Courts of Record, beginning in and proceeding from his Majesty's Courts of King's Bench, of Common Pleas, and of Exchequer, and tried by the Judges of Assize in the course of their respective circuits, was of that kind to which he had first called the attention of their Lordships as being so moderate, not to say so trifling, in its intrinsic value, as to make the expense of it out of all keeping to the value of the thing litigated. This being the amount of the mischief, and the evil of it consisting in the expense, in the distance, and in the delay of our tribunals, and in the consequent vexation arising to the suitor from each of these causes severally, and from all of them collectively, the question for the consideration of their Lordships was, how that evil could be most safely, most conveniently, and most expeditiously remedied; and in looking for a remedy, doubtless it was natural for their Lordships to resort to the days of other times, and to the years that were gone by, to see whether they could find in the older institutions of the country any clue to guide them, any analogy which they could apply to the improvement of its present institutions, either by reviving that which had become obsolete, or by new modelling that which had been still left to them in the progress of time, or by founding, but not at hazard or random, but on the analogy of other experiments which had been tried and been found to answer, new institutions in name and appearance, but old and revived institutions in principle and effect. And the first suggestion which would rise up in the minds of their Lordships would be connected with the ancient County Courts. He knew that antiquaries differed as to the original jurisdiction of these Courts, some holding that it was confined to civil causes alone, and others —of whom he was one, though he did not consider his authority to be of much weight —contended that it was an extensive jurisdiction, and had cognizance, not only of civil and ecclesiastic, but also of criminal matters, and that from it branched off the Court Leet and the Court Baron, which had not of themselves any original jurisdiction. That in early times the County Courts exercised an extraordinary jurisdiction appeared from records still in existence, of undoubted authenticity. In the seventh year after the Conquest, there was tried in the County Court of Kent, before the Archbishop of Canterbury and his Peers, a cause in which a natural brother of the Conqueror, Odo Bishop of Bayeux, was a party, and in which a very important question as to his manorial rights over a very extensive property, was decided, after a hearing which lasted for three or four days. The judgment given in the County Court on that occasion was, as many of their Lordships knew, afterwards recognized and confirmed by Parliament. In the 6th year of Edward 1st, when the Statute of Gloucester was passed, it did not appear that the jurisdiction of the County Court was limited to cases in which the cause of action did not exceed 40*s.* in value, although at that time, as their Lordships were aware, 40*s.* were of much greater value than at present. Certainly, in less than a century from the time in which the Statute of Gloucester was passed, the jurisdiction of the County Court was limited to causes of 40*s.* value, though, previously to that time, there could be no doubt that causes of any value, in which a right of freehold was not made a question, could be tried by it. It therefore appeared to him, that the County Court originally was a tribunal for the trial of causes of all kinds and of all amounts, though latterly its jurisdiction had been confined to causes of a civil nature and of a smaller amount. He prayed their Lordships to recollect that this sum of 40*s.* was computed by Lord Chief Justice Hale to be equal to 10*l.* of the money of his day, and that his computation had always been considered as very moderate. He therefore thought, instead of taking the measure of increase in the value of money to be merely tenfold, as Lord Hale had taken it, they might now take it as twentyfold ; and they might safely say, that in consequence of the alteration which had taken place in the number of shillings coined out of the pound of silver, and of the depreciation which had taken place in the value of money since the discovery of the mines of America, that 40*s.* of the reign of Edward 1st were nearer in value to 40*l.* than to 10*l.* of our money. If, then, the County Court could now, as it formerly did, take cognizance of causes of 40*l.* value, their Lordships would see how much his noble and learned friend the Lord Chief Justice and his learned brothers would be relieved in trying causes, by reflecting that he had already proved to them that three, if not four, out of every five causes, which the Judges now tried, would go for trial to the local and more convenient tribunal. If it were fitting to recur to former times to have the benefit of experience, it was often no less expedient to resort to the example of other countries, which fortune had placed in a situation similar in some respects to our own. If he could satisfy their Lordships that some measure of the same kind had been successfully adopted in a country which was in a situation similar to our own, and which originally had possessed the very same code of laws;—if he could prove to their Lordships that that country had gone on improving the old system of County Courts, whilst we had allowed it to fall into desuetude;—if he could demonstrate that no one thing had given the King's subjects in that country a more satisfactory means of redressing their grievances than that system,—he should go a long way to show that, whatever novelty might be attached to the plan which he was now proposing to their approbation, it was not a plan that had been unsupported by experience, or that had been unattended with advantage and success. He alluded to what had taken place in the ancient kingdom of Scotland, of which the laws, in former times, widely as they differed now from the laws of England, were so identically the same with those of this kingdom, that the oldest treatise on law in each of the two countries is said to be a translation from the other, there being a dispute between the lawyers of England and those of Scotland as to which was the original. He was bound, as holding allegiance on a higher tie to the bar of England than to that of Scotland, to say—and he was happy to add, that he could really say it conscientiously—that he believed the treatise on English law to be the original. The treatise of Glanville, who was Lord Chief Justice in the reign of Henry 2nd, was that from which the "*Regiam Majestatem*" of Scotland was taken—a clear proof that at that early period of our history the principles of the Scotch law were the same as those of our own. In those days the people of Scotland had their County Courts as well as the people of England. But they had not given them up as we had; and he would now proceed to inform their Lordships how they had benefitted by retaining them. The Sheriffs, or rather he should say the Earls, originally elected by the people in the Saxon times, came afterwards, in the progress of years, to be nominated by the Crown. By an abuse of its prerogative, those offices were afterwards rendered hereditary in private families to such a degree, that a noble Duke, a friend of his,—whom he did not then see in his place,—or rather, he should say, the ancestors of that noble Duke, enjoyed as an hereditary office in Scotland, that very situation which his noble and learned friend on the cross-bench now filled in England with so much credit to himself and satisfaction to the public. The office of Lord Justice-general in criminal matters in Scotland was hereditary in the family of the Duke of Argyle, and could, if it had not been entailed, have been taken in execution by any person who had gained a judgment against him. In case any of the Dukes of that family had been traders, it could have been taken under the bankrupt laws, and as it would have passed by sale, his assignees could not have been prevented, if they had thought fit to exercise their legal rights, from sitting and acting as Lord Justice-general of Scotland. Neither had this privilege been allowed to fall into desuetude: for on one occasion, where a Campbell was on one side and an individual of a different clan was on the other, his noble friend's ancestor came unexpectedly forward to assert his privilege, and actually attended the circuit where his clansman was to be tried, in order to try him in person for his life. Similar privileges were exercised by different noble families in Scotland for some years after the rebellion of 1715, but they were all abolished, as such abuses deserved to be, by an act of Parliament passed in the year 1745, although the act of Union was cited for the express purpose of showing that these heritable jurisdictions were specially reserved to their several possessors, but cited with the same want of success as had attended it on various occasions,—a fact to which he called their Lordships' attention for objects of a very different nature from those connected with this bill. When these jurisdictions were abolished, Sheriffs Depute were substituted in their stead. Now the Sheriff Depute retained the jurisdiction of the old county courts, little shorn of their ancient splendor and authority. He was the judge in ordinary of each district in Scotland,—he was also the judge in the first instance in those tribunals in which all actions may be, and are habitually, brought. He exercised all his jurisdiction,—he heard all cases at the door of the suitor, not at stated intervals, but daily throughout the year, his door being always open to the suitor, redress being in the hands of the suitor at every hour from his tribunal, without delay, without expense, and without the vexatious process of waiting long for his remedy, and of going into another part of the country to seek it. He need scarcely inform their Lordships that the Courts of the Sheriff Depute, in the first instance, were the favourite Courts of the people of Scotland. He would now proceed to show their Lordships to what extent business was transacted in those Courts, as by so doing he should be able to show them how much the experience of Scotland was in favour of his plan, and how likely that similar results would take place in England should a similar system be adopted. Upon an average of three years, there had been in all the courts of the Sheriffs Depute not less than 22,000 causes—he was not speaking of actions brought—tried—and disposed of in the course of a year. If he were to take the amount of similar causes which would be tried in England, supposing a similar jurisdiction should exist in it, at six times the amount of those tried in Scotland—a calculation which he made on the proportion existing between the numbers of the population of the two countries—there would be 130,000 causes tried and disposed of every year in England; and yet he had already informed their Lordships that out of 80,000 causes annually commenced in England, the numbers tried were only 7,000. So that in England, which was six times more populous than Scotland, and incalculably more wealthy, there were tried only one-third of the number of suits which the Sheriff Courts of Scotland dispose of in a year. Their Lordships might now, perhaps, be desirous of knowing what proportion of these causes found their way into the superior Courts of Scotland by way of appeal. It was only right to inform their Lordships that the Court of Session exercised a superintending power over the Courts of the Sheriffs Depute, in order to keep the principles of the law the same in all parts of Scotland, and to prevent different practices from prevailing in different parts of it. There was, therefore, a right of appeal from these Sheriff Courts to the Courts of Session; but the number of appeals was very small. It was only one in every 117 actions commenced, and only one in every fifty-three cases brought to trial. He ought also to inform their Lordships, that the Sheriffs Depute had a deputy, who was known by the title of the Sheriff-substitute. An appeal lay from the Sheriff-substitute to his principal, the Sheriff Depute. The former was in general a solicitor or writer to the signet: the latter must be a barrister of five years standing. That the people of Scotland were satisfied with the decisions of this officer and his deputy, was evident from the fact that in forty-nine cases out of fifty there was no appeal made against them, and that only 400 cases out of 22,000, which they disposed of annually, ever gave any trouble to the superior Courts of that country. Their Lordships would perhaps also wish to know the amount in money of the matters disposed of in these Courts. Now, if he founded his calculations upon the returns which had been received from the opulent county of Lanark, half a million of property must be disposed of annually by those Courts, in a manner so satisfactory to the suitors as to give rise to scarcely any appeals, and what was no less material, at a very inconsiderable expense. He found that in undefended causes which were tried before the Sheriffs Depute, the expense of a suit, where the cause of action was of the value of 12*l.*, was only 10*s.*; where the cause of action was of the value of 25*l.*, it was 15*s.*; and where the cause of action was of the value of 100*l.*, it was 20*s.* He likewise found that when the cause was defended—"and here" added the Lord Chancellor, "I must observe, that our countrymen, though they are not prone to litigation, being once involved in it, are not prone to yield [*a laugh*] they are prone to carry on their cause as vigorously as the law will permit them, without caring or seeking for compromises; for there is no country in the world in which so little reference is made to arbitrators as in Scotland,"—he found, he said, that the whole expense of this costly litigation, where the cause was defended as far as it could be,—where every thing was done to create delay, except placing a plea on the record to carry it as an appeal to Edinburgh, was 5*l.*, where the property in dispute was of the value of 12*l.*, and was 13*l.* where the property was of the value of 100*l.*; and of this 13*l.* only 1*l.* can be taxed off by the officer who is the auditor of the Court. Now, these are the results of the experience which the people of Scotland have of their Courts of Sheriff Depute. They proved two propositions to his mind most incontestably. The first was, that in the Local Courts of judicature in Scotland, an immense mass of litigation was annually disposed of,—the second was, that the mode of dealing with it was satisfactory, because it was at once easy, expedient, and cheap. He therefore ventured, with great deference to the better judgment of their Lordships, but at the same time with that confidence which, humble as he was, he had a right to feel in a system which had been tried elsewhere and found successful,—he ventured, he said, with great submission, to propose to their Lordships the expediency of listening to the suggestion whether they might not a little retrace the steps by which they had wandered from the system by which the people of Scotland had held so advantageously, and whether they might not safely and beneficially adopt, to a certain extent, the system of County Courts. He would not trouble their Lordships with the reasons which induced him to prefer forming a Court, new in its kind, but modelled upon ancient principles, to refitting for present use our ancient County Courts. The conflicts which they would have to wage with the Sheriffs—the necessary offence which they must give, in the course of such conflicts, to a body so respectable as that out of which the Sheriffs were selected—the prejudices and partialities which they would have to overcome—these all formed part of the argument against the course which he had last mentioned. It was evident, from all the attempts which had been made to recall the ancient County Courts into existence,—and none had ever been made with more zeal and learning than that which had originated with a noble friend of his in the other House of Parliament, who had endeavoured to make them available for the recovery of small debts,—a plan seconded and afterwards taken up by a distinguished personage, who then most fortunately held a high situation in his Majesty's Councils, and to whose enlightened and useful exertions, in patronizing the reforms of the criminal code of his country, it was impossible for that country to feel too grateful;—it was evident, he said, from the opposition which had been made to such plans, taken up as they had been once and again, by individuals who had examined most anxiously into their feasibility, that they must abandon the ancient County Courts as incapable of being now modelled to suit the wants of the country. And, after all, they would abandon nothing: for if they had accomplished the object which they had in view, they would have kept the name, but not the thing—they would have clasped the vision, but not the substance—they would have gained an institution in its nature different, though in its form of the same aspect, and, without retaining the old system, they would have hampered themselves with all its inconveniences to an extent which they would have found intolerable. He, therefore, thought it better to take a new name with a new subject, and to found a new Court, under the name of a Court of Local or Ordinary Jurisdiction. He had detailed at great length in the Bill to which he now solicited the favourable attention of their Lordships, the whole particulars of the plan, which, after long meditation in his own mind, after much consultation with members of every branch of his profession, he now brought forward as the result, he would not say of his own studies, but of the studies of those who were better qualified than himself to deal with this subject He had thrown together in the Bill, not only the general principles on which it was founded, but also the particular details by which it was to be carried into effect. He founded the Bill on two or three principles, which he considered as quite cardinal. The first was, to make no change in the fundamental law of the land; the next was, to make no change in the practice of the Law, which was not in strict and rigorous conformity with established principles; and the third and last was, above all things, to fence and guard all the arrangements of this measure in such wise as to take ample security, by means of a superintending power, vested in the highest Courts of Record in Westminster-hall, against the possibility of the law being changed in those local judicatures, and becoming various in various parts of the country. How these matters should be settled,—under what circumstances appeals should be allowed,—under what restrictions saved,—how the jurisdiction should be limited in amount and kind,—to what controlling power it should be subject, and how that controlling power should be exercised,—were details with which he needed not to trouble their Lordships at that moment, as all he wished to do then was, to introduce his Bill to their favourable consideration. Suffice it, then, to say, that he now proposed,—and if they saw any apparent defect in his proposition he hoped they would supply it; and if they detected anything objectionable he hoped that they would remove it—suffice it to say, that he proposed that there should be, when this measure should generally be put in practice—and he intended to begin his experiment by establishing those two Courts in two counties only, in order that they might be armed with some experience before they extended them all over the country—suffice it, he repeated once more, to say, that he proposed that there should be in every County or Riding, or in every Half-riding, where the Ridings were as extensive as the West-Riding of the county of York, a Judge to be called the Judge Ordinary. He should not sit twice only in every year, as of necessity the Judges of Assize sat when they went their respective circuits, but he should sit after the manner of the ancient county Courts, every month, from month to month, throughout the year, with the exception of one month in Autumn, to be allowed him for necessary recreation. He should proceed at the commencement of each calendar month, and their Lordships knew that the ancient County Courts went not by calendar but by lunar months, to hold his Court. Before him in that Court, if the parties to an action chose to prefer cheap law to dear law, a near tribunal to a distant tribunal, and speedy justice to delay, they might bring their cause, no matter as to its amount, by certain statements called pleadings, which were laid down in the schedule to the Bill. He was happy to have an opportunity of acknowledging that on this part of his measure he had availed himself of the profound learning and ingenuity of the Law Commissioners, who had dealt so ably with the subject of pleading in their second report. The Judge Ordinary he intended to invest with jurisdiction over the following cases:—All actions of debt, trespass, and trover, where the sum sought to be recovered did not exceed 100*l.*;—all actions of tort, as for assault, libel, seduction, and the like, where the damages to be recovered did not exceed 50*l.*;—and all actions for breaches of agreement, where the damages to be recovered did not exceed 100*l.*; subject, however, to an appeal from his Court, whenever any title to freehold, leasehold, or copyhold property came in question in course of the issue. He would propose, moreover, that the Judges who should preside in these Courts should be men of character and weight in the profession; and not, as had been too often the case, with what were erroneously supposed to be inferior legal appointments,—men of little or no experience in the Courts of Westminster-hall. It was a vain and a most pernicious mistake to suppose that what were called moderate or trifling (in a pecuniary point of view) causes, could be satisfactorily disposed of by Judges of moderate ability and experience. There was nothing either in the theory or the practice of the inferior judicial establishments of the country to warrant such a mischievously absurd proposition. There were, in this part of the United Kingdom, some 240—perhaps he should be more correct in saying some 280—Courts of Conscience and Courts of Requests, and other inferior local tribunals for the adjudication of cases involving interests of comparatively minor importance; which Courts, he was free to admit, were felt by the country, and justly too, when they took into consideration the evils consequent upon what he might, for the sake of brevity, term the higher litigations, to be comparatively great blessings. But still, whosoever was acquainted with the machinery and proceedings of these Courts would, he was sure, admit, in fact, could not doubt, that, comparing their results with the wants of the suitors seeking in them redress for their grievances, they were imperfect and inefficient, and, what was more, by no means, all things considered, uncostly; they were, in truth, in a great national legislative point of view, of little benefit, and might, with great advantage to the public, be absorbed,—he meant ultimately absorbed,—in the more efficient, better adapted, because better constituted, and not more expensive, Courts which his bill proposed to establish. Two species of action were usually tried in the Courts of Conscience and of Requests,—one for debts or claims for sums under 2*l.*; the other for sums not exceeding 5*l.* Now it was meant to leave both in a great measure to the ordinary jurisdictions until such time as the functions of both Courts were absorbed, as he had stated, into those of the proposed local tribunals. It would be left to the suitors to choose between the new County Courts and the ordinary jurisdictions up to 5*l.*, as it would be left to the suitors to choose between the County Courts in causes falling within their adjudicatory powers, but involving, as it might happen, complicated and important interests; but it would be compulsory (so we understood the noble and learned Lord) on all litigants in causes for 100*l.* by way of debt, or 50*l.* by way of tort, to seek redress in the proposed County Courts, and not to go elsewhere to the higher tribunals, unless, as he had stated, the case involved questions of freehold, or tenure, or other complicated interests incapable of a quick decision. This would be the more easily effected, it struck him, on account of the condition which he had laid down for the appointment of the Judges of the County Courts,—namely, established ability and experience as a lawyer. And here he trusted their Lordships would permit him to remind them of a principle or fact which should never be forgotten when attempting to legislate with a view to facilitating and rendering more cheap the means of justice—that the amount of the sum at issue between litigants,—that is to say, that what was called a moderate action, involving comparatively but little pecuniary interest, was no standard of the ability and knowledge required in the presiding Judge, was no measure of the importance, the intrinsic paramount importance, to the parties engaged in the suit, and therefore was not to be got rid of hastily by some member of the profession of but little skill or experience. It might, if their Lordships would, be a matter of but little or secondary moment, whether justice were brought home to the very doors of suitors,—whether, for example, a suitor should have to go from a distance in the county to Lancaster, or from Huddersfield to York; but still, if the sum at issue were but 20*l.*—nay but 10*l.*—it was as much to a poor man, and its loss was as great a loss to him, and the sense of injustice rankling in his bosom from its being withheld from him, and from the difficulties placed in the way of his obtaining redress, whether those difficulties were of distance or expense, or delay, with all the consequent anxieties and sufferings of mind—were as great, he said, to the poor man, as many thousands to most of their Lordships, and were, therefore, as well worthy of consideration to Parliament, acting in its great national legislative capacity, and on the great national legislative principle of equal laws and equal protection from those laws—that is, of equal justice. It was then, he would say, the bounden duty of the Government, be its members who they may, to have the law administered so that the poor man might obtain redress for his grievances as expeditiously, and to him as cheaply, as the richer suitor, and not, as was too much the case at present, owing to the defects of our legal institutions, that causes involving smaller interests were to be regarded of little moment, being, as it were, of little public importance. He contended they were of great public importance, as it signified much to the poor man that he should have his just grievances promptly and cheaply redressed. It was no objection that those minor causes—minor so far as money was concerned—would take up as much of a Judge's time, as one in which 20 or 100 times the amount might be involved. His objection to the present system was, not that the cause in which 10*l.* or 20*l.* was the amount in dispute would occupy as much time and skill on the part of the Judge as one for 100*l.* or 1,000*l.*; but—and this was his deep regret, his grief—that the small case was attended with great and most unproportioned and most unnecessary expense and delay. It was not to the litigation, but to the expense and delay that he objected, for he felt that the line between cases of comparatively little, and of great pecuniary moment, which they were bound to observe, was that of expense and delay, and not the qualification of the Judges, so far as inferiority and superiority in either case were concerned. It should be borne in mind, too, that the great bulk of the suits which came for decision before the ordinary tribunals originated with the middling and poorer classes of society, to whom, he again and again repeated, the interests involved, be they great or be they small,—be they for pounds or shillings,—were as dear and as important as matters of greater moment to persons in higher and wealthier stations in society, rendering it still more necessary that the law should be generally accessible, and expeditious, and cheap. Nor were they to take the measure of litigation as a guide to the measure of the wants of the litigants; from the number of causes annually disposed of—say, at the Assizes, or in Westminster-hall. When he said, that many causes originated with the middling and poorer classes, he was not to be met by a reference to the number disposed of. For example, it must not be supposed that because but fifty causes were set down for trial at Lancaster in 1826, or but seventy-six in York in 1829, that, therefore, there did not exist more complaints unredressed in those districts,—that these were the measure of the demands of justice, and that, as a consequence, any greater facilities than those existing would only tend to stimulate the disposition of the public to vexatious and needless litigation. By no means; what the people wanted was, that the law should be, he repeated for the hundredth time, easy, accessible, and cheap. Make it so, and they would have the suitors more numerous,—in other words, they would have the law effecting its legitimate object of redressing the grievances of every man who himself obeyed it. And here he begged leave to combat a very general allusion, in which, not only many respectable persons out of doors partook, but he feared, also, many of their Lordships,—namely, that litigation should be more discouraged than otherwise. This was an idle common-place assertion, which could not bear the test of a close examination. This complaint was, not that we had, under our existing system of law, too many suitors, but that we had too few; and for this reason,—so long as wrongs were committed and rights withheld, so long there was necessity for litigation; and as it was vain to assert that inferior causes required Judges of inferior knowledge and ability for their decision, so it was vain and preposterous to take any standard for the necessity of providing for the wants of the less wealthy suitors in courts of justice than that he had then named,—the amount of wrongs committed,—the amount of rights withheld,—that is to say, so long as justice was denied to any portion of the public. So long as justice was denied, litigation was necessary, and so long had the people a right to demand a more accessible and cheap administration of justice than the present means afforded; and be that justice denied by force or by fraud, or by the oppression of the rich, or by unnecessary and vexatious expense, so far and so long were the subjects of the King of England denied what they were entitled to under the great charter to which the King had sworn,—namely, that he should "neither sell nor delay justice." And justice was sold so long as suitors had to pay three times more than was necessary for it; it was delayed, so long as they had to wait a single unnecessary week,—nay, day,—he might say hour, for it; and it was denied, so long as the price of obtaining it placed it beyond the reach of any class of his Majesty's subjects. And it was because he, after much consideration and conference on the subject, had felt that, under our existing legal tribunals, justice was sold, and delayed, and denied, that he ventured to submit his present measure to the consideration of the Legislature, entreating their Lordships to bestow upon it their most serious attention, as one involving principles of paramount importance to themselves and to the public. Without then entering into a statement of the details of his Bill—a proper opportunity would shortly present itself—he begged leave to point out to their notice, especially to the notice of those noble and learned Lords practically conversant with the subject, two of its provisions; the one investing his proposed local jurisdiction with a somewhat of Equitable functions in certain cases of legacies for sums not exceeding 100*l.*; the other investing them with a jurisdiction similar to that exercised in those Courts (in force in some foreign States, presently to be mentioned) called "Courts of Reconcilement." With respect to the first of these provisions, it was well known to two noble and learned Lords near him (Lords Eldon and Lyndhurst) that nothing was more common than for the executor, in cases of 60*l.*, and 80*l.*, and 100*l.* legacies, to become insolvent, or to have suffered a distress, before the legatee had derived any advantage from the will of the testator; and, as those noble and learned Lords, from their experience in the Court over which they had so ably presided, knew, there was no remedy for the legatee save a suit in Equity,—a remedy, the very sound of which, unfortunately, usually scared away the grieved party from all means of redress, it being considered as an evil which even the temptation of a legacy could not induce the less wealthy classes,—those to whom his observations, it was evident, then particularly applied,—to encounter; and thus persons whose circumstances in life rendered them the less fitting victims of this defeat of the good intentions of testators, were but too often deprived of even the chance of recovering legacies, should the executor chance to be insolvent, or even simply fraudulent. It might happen in these cases, that the executor had the money in his pocket,—that he did not deny the rights of the legatee to its possession, but refused to give it up, on the idle pretence that he did not feel himself relieved from the responsibility of other claims; and the legatee had no redress but to bring him before the Lord Chancellor, or file a bill of discovery; or the executor might admit the possession of the money, but deny the right of the legatee; or he might deny both, or admit both, but contend that he did not exercise his trust, because, as an insolvent, all property in his hands ceased to be his; and as before, there was no remedy but the tedious, expensive, and, as the poor suitors believed, most uncertain process, of a suit in equity. As a remedy to this great grievance, he proposed by his Bill to invest the Judges of the local jurisdictions with the power of compelling the executors in such cases, for legacies not exceeding 100*l.*, to pay into the Judges hands the money willed: only, of course, to be taken out on the production of proper receipts and vouchers; and by this means he was persuaded much of the evil to poor legatees, which he had just pointed out, would be avoided. While he stated this, his own conviction, he was bound in fairness also to state, that he had had much conference on the subject with many hon. and learned friends—eminent authorities in the Courts of Equity, and that many of these most respectable individuals had declared a great repugnance to his proposed change, founded on apprehensions of serious difficulties from its accomplishment; but that many others of his learned friends, equally competent to give an opinion, had, on the other hand, evinced no such repugnance, but, on the contrary, had approved of it, and were apprehensive of no material inconvenience or difficulty from its adoption. As there existed this difference of opinion, he trusted he might be permitted to recommend the point to the serious consideration of their Lordships, particularly to his noble and learned friends near him, whom professional experience had rendered the most competent judges of its merits. The next provision of his Bill, to which he begged leave to invite the attention of the House, was the other species of jurisdiction with which he proposed to invest the new Local Courts' Judges,--he meant that jurisdiction founded on the practice known in some of the Continental States, in what were designated "Courts of Reconcilement." To make what he had to say in recommendation of this practice the more readily understood, he would observe, that if the suitors who daily thronged the Courts of Common-law had, instead of consulting a counsel or an attorney, or any other person equally interested in the actual existence of an action, the advantage of a previous conference with a conciliatory Judge, he would not say that nine cases out of ten, but certainly two out of three would never be brought to trial, and the plaintiff or the defendant, as it might be, saved the time, and expense, and anxiety of a protracted, but most uselessly contested suit. At present a man went to law, so to speak, blindfold. After having incurred great expense, and lost much of his valuable time, he is, perhaps, on the very eve of the day of trial, informed by his counsel or attorney, what they ought to have informed him of long before—that he was throwing away his time, and patience, and money, for that a verdict would be inevitably recorded against him, according to the common course of justice. To prevent as much as possible the great waste of time and money, and this greater abuse of trust and justice, he proposed to invest the Judges of the Local Jurisdiction Courts with the functions, in certain cases, of the continental Courts of Reconcilement. Did their Lordships seek for proofs of the excellent results of these institutions, let them examine the legal records of the continental States in which they have had a fair trial. In Denmark—he admitted a most favourable selection for his argument—Courts of Reconcilement had been established in 1795; and it would be seen that the fruit, the beneficial fruit, which they had produced was, that the number of causes tried in the ordinary Courts in that kingdom in 1797 was actually reduced in the proportion of three to one. He was, however, enabled to appeal to much more recent results, having been favoured with a return of the numbers of causes submitted to the Courts of Reconcilement in the Danish States in the year 1823. From that return he found that the number of causes brought before these Courts in that year was 31,000. (And here he begged leave to parenthetically observe, that according, to the principles which he had a few minutes before laid down concerning litigation, he did not think this number too great for the population of Denmark, as compared with the population of this country—as circumstances of a very different nature might exist in both countries, which might occasion a necessity for litigation in the one which could not apply to the other, and *vice versa;* so that no inference with respect to the amount of litigation in this country was warrantable from the mere comparison of numbers.) Of these, not less than 21,000 were disposed of in the Courts of Reconcilement without further delay or expense: and of the remaining 10,000 referred to the usual tribunals, 600 and odd were abandoned; and of the remaining 9,426 referred to the other Courts, but 2,355 were decided on that year; bearing out his statement, that not less than two causes out of the three, which in this country would most probably have gone to a needless, and dilatory, and most expensive trial, were, in the Danish Courts of Reconcilement, disposed of conciliatingly, without this great waste of time, patience, and money. Such were the leading features of the Bill which he was about to lay on their Lordships' Table. In stating them he had done what he had proposed to himself in the commencement of his address. It remained for him only to express his own deep sense of its importance, and to again express his regret, that, owing to the accidental circumstance at which he had glanced in the early part of his speech, he should be compelled thus early to trespass so long on their Lordships' most patient attention. "My Lords," continued the noble and learned Baron, "I deem it a duty of the highest importance that the Government should take care that the laws be loved and respected. I know, too, that there are times and seasons when a change, however slight, in those laws, constitutes no part of the duty of the Government. Such I deem seasons of foreign wars, periods of domestic distress and commotion, casting a cloud over the prospects of the country, and, above all, times in which intestine commotion concentrates all public care on the means of preserving tranquillity. But when tranquillity prevails abroad, as, thank God, it does now; and when—and I thank Heaven I can say so—there is every reason to pronounce the disturbances which disfigure some parts of this country to be but as a passing cloud over the fair face of our general prosperity, — and when men's minds have been, as they have of late years, so influenced, and directed, and echoed by the great organs of the public voice as to be lifted up with one loud and unanimous acclaim for law reform—when all these so unequivocally conspire towards the one object, it appears to me, much revolving on these matters, that this is the most appropriate time, and this the appointed season for us all, my Lords, to join in undertaking the great work. And if all times of general tranquillity are fitting for such an undertaking as that I now propose to you,—and if this be the appointed time and this the appropriate season,—I say that this week,—nay, that this very day is more especially so. Unhappily, owing to the temper which the disturbances that disfigure certain parts of the country too clearly evince, it has been found necessary, by his Majesty's Ministers, to provide extraordinary measures, with a view to have the laws obeyed. Within a few days from the time I am now addressing your Lordships the sword of justice shall be unsheathed, to smite, if it be necessary, with a firm and vigorous hand, the rebel against the law. My Lords, it is the duty, the great office, the high function of the Government,—it is the King's most sacred duty,—it is all our deepest interests, that the law should be obeyed. It is the no less sacred, and high, and paramountly important duty of your Lordships, as legislators, to take care that the laws be loved: and when the Ministers resolve, on the one hand, in their executive capacity, with a determination from which no threat shall make them swerve, when no supineness can make them slumber, when faithfully performing their duty to themselves, to their King, and, if possible, still more faithfully to the King's people, by enforcing the laws as the greatest mercy to the deluded offenders against them, let me pray your Lordships, on the other hand, in your capacity as law-givers in this most fitting moment—on this most graceful occasion, —to take care by making the laws better, that you make them the more loved. I counsel you to leave no means unattempted befitting your high station,—and to let no pride of place prevent your earnestly setting about this great work. And let neither your station nor pride be offended when I tell you that a feeling has gone abroad of disrespect towards both Houses of Parliament, which, fortunately, both Houses have it yet in their power to allay. The ties which should bind the several orders in the State to each other, particularly the people to the Parliament, should be, as they have been often said to be like those of domestic union; and if unhappily—to continue the simile—there should arise domestic jars between the two parties, possessing so deep and intimate a common interest, if one party should be temporarily alienated—I would not counsel you to practise unworthy artifices to remove that alienation, far less would I counsel you to condescend to meretricious blandishments, to allure those who stood aloof from you: No, I would say, 'Maintain your own rights, preserve your own dignity, but take care and do your duty to yourselves and the alienated party, by proper attentions, and removing all just grounds of complaint.' Trust me my Lords, the road to duty, the door of reconcilement is open to you; and it will be exclusively your own faults if again the language of disrespect is addressed to you from any portion of the King's subjects. What, I repeat to you, the people want and love, is cheap justice. What they hate and rail against is, expensive, and tardy, and uncertain litigation. And can there be a duty at once more pleasing and more befitting your high stations—one, too, the exercise of which is just now of such all-importance to the integrity of the institutions of the country in Church and State,—than when you show the people on the one hand that you are firmly resolved to resist lawless aggression; and on the other that you are willing listeners to their complaints—readily sympathise with their wants, and that by amending the laws, while by so doing you the better preserve them, and make them the better worth preserving,— you satisfy the people with respect to the institutions they are living under, and thus conduce to render them more worthy of their love and confidence? By doing this, and doing it, too, this night, this moment, you will do more towards allaying the ferment of the public mind than all that the declamation of the greatest orator could devise, or the sagest lawgiver frame, or the most conciliatory Government adopt,—more than by any other means towards preserving unimpaired all the institutions of the country to your latest posterity,—more towards connecting your high names with after ages by the noblest tie—that of the rights, and liberties, and happiness of a great people."

Lord *Lyndhurst*:—The ordinary course, my Lords, when measures of such vast consequence are first presented for your Lordships' consideration, is to lay the Bill containing the details of these measures on the Table, and then to order it to be printed; and to allow your Lordships a competent time to examine them thoroughly, before the Bill is read a second time. Such is the course which, as I understand him, my noble and learned friend proposes to follow on this occasion: so that your Lordships may have the opportunity of coming fully prepared, at the second reading, to discuss the principles and details of this new and extensive alteration in the system of administrative justice. At present I content myself with saying, that the plan is one of the highest importance; and I fully concur with my noble friend in the opinion, that your Lordships are bound to give it your most serious attention. For we must consider that the effect of it, if it should be adopted by the Legislature, will be, to create fifty new Courts of Justice, to be presided over by fifty new Judges, and each of these Courts to be attended with the establishment which is neceessarily connected with a Court of Justice. These may be considered as minor circumstances; but, certainly, the consequence of adopting the measure will be to make a wide and expensive alteration in our judicial establishments. When the Bill shall have been printed, I will direct the most anxious and careful attention to its principles and the whole of its details, that I may come to the discussion on the second reading, as fully prepared as the most unremitting inquiry will enable me to be. And if, after the most anxious attention, and the most careful inquiry, I should feel myself compelled to differ from my noble and learned friend, I will freely and candidly state to your Lordships the grounds and reasons of my dissent. But if, upon the most candid, careful, and anxious inquiry, I should be convinced that this is a wise and salutary measure—a real improvement—then I will give it my most cordial and zealous support.

Bill read a first time, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, Dec. 2.

MINUTES.] On the Motion of Mr. S. RICA, a new Writ was ordered for the Borough of Calne, in the room of Sir J. MACDONALD, who, since his election, had been appointed a Commissioner of the Board of Control for the Affairs of India.

The Committee appointed to try the merits of the Queenborough Election, reported that P. C. H. DURHAM, Esq., and W. HOLMES, Esq., were not duly returned; and that J. CAPEL, Esq. and THOS. GLADSTONE, Esq., were duly elected.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. HUME, the number of persons imprisoned in the Gaol of Glasgow for Debt, from the year 1827 to 1830 inclusive, distinguishing the sums for which they were arrested; also the emoluments of the Clerks of the Peace and Sheriffs Clerks (Scotland):—On the Motion of Mr JEPHSON, the number of Steam Packets employed in conveying the Mail to Ireland.

Petitions presented. By Mr. EVANS, from the Inhabitants of Anstey, in Leicestershire, praying for Reform of Parliament and Vote by Ballet. By Mr. SCHONSWAR, from Shopkeepers in Kingston-upon-Hull, for the abolition of Stamp Duties on Receipts for small amounts. For the abolition of Slavery, by Mr. A. LEFROY. from Cork, Antrim, and Armagh:—By Mr. C. W. WYNN, from certain Baptists in the County of Carnarvon:—By Sir W. GUISE, from places in Gloucestershire:—By Lord MORPETH, from different places in Yorkshire:—By Mr. HODGSON, from Baptists in Newcastle-upon-Tyne:—By Mr. CURTEIS, from a Parish in Sussex:—By Mr. BRISCOE, from several places in Surrey:—By Mr. J. JOHNSTON, from Linlithgow:—By Mr. S. LUMLEY, from a Parish in Nottingham:—By Mr. CAMPBELL, from Cupar:—By Mr. OWEN, from Pembroke:—By Mr. EVANS, from Ashby, de-la-Zouch;—By Sir M. S. STEWART, from Rothesay: By Mr. ADEANE, from Cambridge. By Mr. KENNEDY-from Ayr, praying that compensation might be given to the Slave-owners, in case Slavery should be abolished. By Lord MORPETH, from Hull, praying for a more speedy and less expensive mode for the recovery of small Debts. By Mr. HODGSON, from Newcastle-on-Tyne, praying for the abolition of the Duty on Coals. By Sir W. INGILBY, from a Parish in the County of Norfolk, complaining of Distress, and praying for a reduction of Tithes and Taxes. By Sir W. W. WYNN, from a Parish in the County of Denbigh, against the Truck System. For giving the Elective Franchise of Galway to Catholics, by Mr. M'NAMARA, Mr. S. RICE, and Mr. D. BROWNE. By Mr. WRIGHTSON, from Kingston-upon-Hull, for a repeal of all Taxes on Industry. By Mr. CURTEIS, from Billinghurst, Sussex, praying for a Reform in Parliament, and the employment of the Ballot in Elections.

TREGONY BOROUGH ELECTION.] The *Speaker* acquainted the House that Charles Harper, who had presented a petition on the 16th of November, complaining of an undue election for the Borough of Tregony, had not entered into the recognizances required by the Act of Parliament.

Mr. D. W. Harvey presented a Petition from Mr. C. Harper, praying that the time for lodging the recognizances might be extended to Thursday next, and praying to be heard in support of the prayer of his petition.

The Motion was then put, that Charles Harper be called to the Bar.

Sir *E. B. Sugden* opposed the petition. There was no reason to depart in this case from the rules prescribed by the Act of Parliament.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, the House had power to grant the prayer of the petition, and he thought it ought to be granted.

Mr. *Littleton* also thought the Parliament ought to enlarge the time for entering into the recognizances.

Mr. *Ross* saw no reason for granting the indulgence, and was opposed to the House acting contrary to its own laws.

Mr. *Hume* said, there had been no intention to violate the Act of Parliament; and that the case deserved the favourable consideration of the House.

Mr. *Goulburn* contended, that the petitioner had not complied with the Act of Parliament, and was not entitled to the indulgence of the House.

The House then agreed that the petitioner should be called to the Bar. On the further question, that the time for entering the recognizances be enlarged till Thursday,

The *Attorney General* thought it extremely inconvenient that the House should have to enter into these cases. He was unwilling to exclude persons from the benefits of an enlargement of their recognizances; but some attention ought to be paid by the parties to the Acts of Parliament.

Sir *R. Peel* said, there was a manifest inconvenience in laying down rules if they were not to be adhered to. The petitioner had urged that he had never read the Act of Parliament; but if the House extended the time on such a plea, it was giving a manifest advantage to the negligent.

Mr. *O'Connell* maintained that the petitioner had not violated the letter of the law. There was nothing in the Act to prevent a petitioner giving in more names than were required, as a prudent precaution in case some of his securities should not be able to pass examination.

Sir *R. Peel* thought the hon. Member's speech a mere attempt at special pleading. The law was clear and positive, and admitted not of any such interpretation.

Mr. *North* maintained that the Act only mentioned six and four securities as extreme numbers, including the intermediate number.

Sir *E. B. Sugden* thought it impossible by such arguments to get rid of the plain words of the Act.

Mr. *Campbell* said, that the petitioner had been guilty of gross negligence, and the petition ought not to be received.

The *Speaker* recapitulated the case to the House, and stated, that the petitioner had been duly informed of what was required by the Act.

Lord *Palmerston* thought that no favour should be granted unless the petitioner could show that he had taken every precaution to avoid a breach of the law. The dismissal of the petition would not prevent the House trying the validity of the election.

The House divided; Against the Motion 83; For it 23—Majority 60.

LAW OF ENFEOFFMENTS (SCOTLAND).] Sir *W. Rae* rose, pursuant to notice, to move for leave to bring in a Bill to alter and amend the laws regarding the taking of Enfeoffments in heritable property in Scotland. The hon. and learned Baronet described the state of those laws, as they at present existed, as loudly calling for amendment. By the measure which he meant to propose, the parties executing enfeoffments would be protected against the risk and expense to which they were at present exposed. The risk was great, because the most trifling technical error, in any one step of the proceedings in cases of enfeoffments, vitiated the whole; and the expense would be at once apparent when he stated, that on an average of ten years, the number of enfeoffments was annually 6,000 which imposed a tax on the land of 80,000*l.* sterling. He was anxious that the Bill should be brought in and printed; and two or three months might then be given to enable the country to consider its provisions.

Mr. *Kennedy* was well pleased that he had withdrawn his limited measure last year, and thus given the hon. and learned Baronet an opportunity of introducing his more comprehensive plan. If any odium were likely to be excited, in any quarter, by the introduction of this measure, he was perfectly ready to take his share of it. He thought the measure would be found extremely beneficial.

Sir *M. S. Stewart* approved of the measure, because it tended to simplify the cumbrous machinery of this portion of the law. The country was highly indebted to the exertions of the hon. and learned Baronet, who had recently retired without provision from the laborious situation which he had so ably filled. He wished to know whether any person had been appointed to that office? In his opinion, the hon. and learned Baronet ought to be placed in the first high official situation which became vacant.

Mr. *G. Lamb* concurred in all the praises which had been bestowed on the hon. and learned Baronet. In answer to the question which had been asked by the hon. Member who had just sat down, he had to state, that a gentleman had been appointed to the office referred to, and the papers connected with that appointment were going through the proper department.

Leave was given to bring in the Bill.

TESTS—(IRELAND).] Mr. *North* rose to move for leave to bring in a Bill to extend to Protestants of the Established Church in Ireland the provisions of the Irish Statute of the 19th and 20th of George 3rd, cap. 6, permitting Protestant Dissenters to hold office without receiving the sacrament. The Act in question, the benefit of which he wished to extend to Protestants, was originally passed in the reign of Queen Anne, and was subsequently amended in that of George 3rd, to which he had alluded. The object of the first act was to exclude Protestant Dissenters from office, by establishing, as a test for the qualification of office, the necessity of receiving the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the forms of the Church of England. The Act of 1793 repealed that test, with respect to Dissenters in Ireland. The Act which passed two Sessions ago, for the relief of Dissenters, from the necessity of taking the sacrament as a qualification for office, took away that necessity from all classes; but the Act did not extend beyond England, it being understood that the Dissenters of Ireland were fully relieved by the Irish Act of 1793. So that, in fact, the Protestants belonging to the Established Church in Ireland were at this moment the only class of subjects of the United Kingdom who were still obliged to take the sacrament as a qualification, and who of course were liable to a penalty for taking office without such qualification. Thus, in the process of legislation, it happened that what was originally intended as a bar to Dissenters only, now remained on the Statutes as a bar to Protestants of the Established Church, whose exclusion was never intended. Under these circumstances, he thought the House would go with him in admitting the necessity of doing away with this as a form useless as a qualification for office. He would therefore, without further comment, move for leave to bring in his Bill.

Sir *R. H. Inglis* did not object to the principle of the motion, but he doubted whether further legislation was necessary on a subject already so clearly expressed in the Act of 1793. That, he thought, was so clear as to be understood by every man, woman, and child who could read it, and he was not aware that any doubt had been raised on the subject in any Court of Law.

Mr. *North* said, the hon. Baronet had not correctly understood him if he supposed no doubt existed. As to Protestant Dissenters the Act was clear enough, but it was not so with respect to Protestants of the Established Church, and those doubts had been alluded to in the 23rd of George 3rd.

Leave given to bring in the Bill.

FREEHOLDERS IN IRELAND.] Mr. *Wyse* rose, pursuant to the notice he had given, to move for a return specifying the number of 50*l.*, 20*l.*, and 10*l.* freeholders and clergymen who voted at the General Elections of this year, for the return of Members to Parliament from counties in Ireland. At the present moment, when we were waiting for the discussion of the most interesting subject which could engage the attention of Parliament,—that of reform,—it was important that every information which could bear on the question should be before the House. By the returns for which he now moved, it would be seen how far the influence of the Crown was exercised on the constituency of that country, by showing how the clergy voted; for in some counties, by the effect of the bill for disfranchising the 40*s*. freeholders, the clergy now bore a more than ordinary proportion to the persons entitled to vote. In one county, out of 191 votes there were thirty-one clergymen who voted against the popular candidate. The votes of the clergy had this advantage—that they were not subject to registry, and that they might vote at any booth they pleased; thus having the power to turn the scale at that booth. He had no wish to limit the elective franchise in any case; but he did not see why that of clergymen should not be exercised under the same formalities as those which regulated the franchise of other freeholders. He would not go further into the subject at present, as a more fit opportunity would occur hereafter; but he trusted that what he had said would show a fair ground for acceding to his Motion.

Mr. *Leader* said, that he had no objection to the motion of his hon. friend, but he thought it would be useful to extend it, and to show also the number of 40*s*. freeholders who voted at the last General Election. The number had been reduced to a comparatively small amount. Not more than about 3,000 had voted; but these, though the poorest, were, he believed, the most honest and valuable portion of the electors. He the more readily concurred in the motion of his hon. friend, as he thought it was important to inquire into the amount of ecclesiastical patronage at elections.

Motion agreed to.

On the Motion of Mr. H. Drummond, the name of Sir George Clerk was added to the Committee of Standing Orders.

On the Motion of Mr. S. Rice, the Consolidated Fund Bill went through a Committee, and the report was ordered to be received on Monday.

COLONIAL ACTS' VALIDITY BILL.] Mr. Spring Rice moved that the Committee on this Bill be postponed to Monday.

Mr. *Campbell* observed, that from what fell from him on a former evening on this Bill, it seemed to be understood that he was opposed to its progress. This was far from being the case. He gave the Bill his entire assent as far as it went, and his only objection was, that it did not go far enough. The Bill was to render valid all acts of colonial governors performed within six months after the late demise of the Crown, for without such an Act their acts would be invalid, and many of them would be liable to actions. So far he fully concurred, but he thought the Bill ought to go further, and be made general and prospective,—that it should go, not merely to acts done since the late demise of the Crown, but extend to all future cases of a demise of the Crown. He hoped the day was far distant when such an event would occur, but the inevitable hour must come at some time, and it would be much better to make at the present moment a provision which would be applicable to all such events in future, than to have a new Act necessary as each case occurred; for if we did not make provision for it now, we should have to pass a similar bill at a future period. He would therefore suggest that such a provision should be now made applicable to all future cases of a demise of the Crown.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, his object in postponing the Bill was to give an opportunity to the noble Lord who had charge of the Bill, and who was not now in the House, to consider the very valuable suggestion made by the hon. and learned Gentleman.

Committee postponed.

PENSIONS AND SALARIES. — POSTMASTER-GENERAL OF IRELAND.] Mr. Spring Rice presented (pursuant to address) an account of the Pensions on the Civil List, and several other papers relating to Salaries of Public Offices.

Mr. *Hume* wished to know to what date those returns were brought down?

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, they were down to last June. There were among the papers some Treasury Minutes relating to the office of Vice-treasurer of Ireland. These, however, would not show the whole of the reductions and alterations to be made in that office, as further arrangements had since been made, and some were in progress, which would tend greatly to simplify the manner of keeping the accounts. While he was on his legs, he wished to say a word as to a question which had been put to him by his hon. friend, the member for Middlesex, on a former evening, respecting the officer of Postmaster-general of Ireland, and he was the more anxious to do so, as he did not wish that any misconception should arise from what he had said. In answer to the question of his hon. friend, he stated that it was not the intention of Government to fill up the vacant office of Postmaster-general of Ireland. Now, the facts of the case, with which he was not at that time in full possession, were simply these:—soon after the late general election Lord O'Neil, who held the situation of Postmaster-general of Ireland, jointly with Lord Ross, was removed from that office. The salary of the office, which till then had been paid to Lord O'Neil only—Lord Ross having had no salary—was transferred to the latter noble Lord; so that, in effect, no saving of salary was made to the public. Within the last two days, however, the resignation of Lord Ross had been received, so that the situation was wholly vacant, and it was now the determination of Government to get rid of the office altogether, it not being necessary to the transaction of business in that department of the public service.

Mr. *Hume* said, he was glad to hear the statement of his hon. friend that the office was to be abolished. It was only that day that he received a letter from Dublin, stating that the office was wholly vacant, but that up to then the salary had been continued to the other noble Lord who had held the situation jointly with Lord O'Neil; and he owned he was surprised at what had fallen from a right hon. Gentleman below him (Mr. Goulburn), who had claimed credit for the late Administration for the intention not to fill up the office. He was glad to find that the credit of the abolition belonged altogether to the new Ministry, and he took it as an earnest of their disposition to practise economy. He was glad to hear what was said by his hon. friend as to the Vice-treasurer of Ireland. His (Mr. Hume's) great object was, to get simplicity in the mode of keeping the accounts, as well as a saving to the public in the amount of salary. He hoped that the accounts now laid on the Table would be printed, and after that should be agreed to, he would move that the accounts of the pensions on the Civil List in England, Scotland, and Ireland, should be brought down to the latest period to which they could be made out —to the present—as he was anxious to see what was done by former Administrations, and to begin a new score with the present Ministry. It was well known that he was anxious to get rid of the system of pensions altogether.

Colonel *Sibthorp* wished to know from the hon. Gentleman (Mr. S. Rice) opposite, whether it was the intention of Government to make a considerable reduction of the salaries of public officers. If it were, he would be ready to give the present Government his most cordial support. He had seen appointments such as that to the Clerk of the Council, and other places, which no man having a due regard for the public interest could approve.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, in answer to the hon. Member's question, he could only say, that it was the intention of Government to make great reductions in every department of the public service. At the same time he would submit to the hon. Member to defer such questions as that he had put till those of his Majesty's confidential advisers who were Members of that House should be in their places, and not apply to an individual holding the humble office that he held.

Mr. *Hume* was glad to hear that a general reduction of salaries was intended. He should wish to hear that every office above 500*l.* a-year were reduced to nearly one-half. The amount paid in large salaries to public officers was enormous. He did not mean to say that many of those who received them were not most efficient public servants; but he thought that all high salaries ought to be reduced, and some of them greatly. He held in his hand an abstract of a parliamentary paper, No. 23 of the present Session, containing an account of the salaries of civil and military offices, of 1,000*l.* a year and upwards, from which, though no returns were yet made of the salaries paid to officers of the House of Lords, or of the Court of Common Pleas, it appeared that the total amount paid in salaries of 1,000*l.* a-year and upwards, was

2,066,574*l.* Of this sum there were paid

To Officers of the House of Commons	£ 19,642
Judicial Officers	466,836
Civil	655,434
Diplomatic and Consular	251,624
Naval and Military	334,327
Colonial	338,711
Total	£2,066,574

This immense revenue was enjoyed by 993 persons, — making an average of 2,081*l.* a-year to each. But of these 993 persons 216 received nearly one-half of that sum. For instance, there were 161 with salaries of 2,500*l.* and under 5,000*l.*; forty-four with 5,000*l.*, and under 10,000*l.*; eleven above 10,000*l.* a-year. Taking the whole of these 216 persons, their salaries averaged above 4,400*l.* a-year each. There were many of these who enjoyed large salaries,—such as Lord Ellenborough and others—when all their duties were performed by deputy. The account he had referred to did not contain the whole amount paid by the public, for it did not include the expense of collecting, or the sums paid to deputies. In fact, the whole amount paid by the public in this way could not be known, except by examination by a committee,—such a committee as that moved for on a former occasion by the hon. member for Dorsetshire. If he should have any thing to do with the formation of such a committee, he would nominate his hon. friend (Colonel Sibthorp) near him, as he should be very glad to avail himself of his valuable assistance on the subject. The only way to get rid of exaggerated statements as to expenditure, which some hon, Members complained of, was by such a committee.

The papers ordered to be printed.

On the Motion of Mr. Hume, similar returns to those on the Table were ordered, to the latest period to which they could be made out.

ADULTERATION OF BEER.] Colonel *Sibthorp* moved for a return of the number of convictions for the adulteration of Beer from 1827 to the present time. Several most flagrant cases of such adulteration had recently occurred, in one of which the mixture prepared would be more injurious to drink than a bottle of Warren's blacking; and yet some of these publicans were fined only small sums, and still allowed to carry on their nefarious trade. If the loss of the license were in such cases to follow the conviction, it would have the effect of checking this practice so injurious to the health of those whose ordinary beverage was beer.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that he did not object to the Motion, but he hoped, as the hon. Member had not given notice of it, he would let it stand as a notice for Monday, by which time he should make inquiry as to the quarter from which the return could be made. A return was ordered the other day, which, on inquiry, he found would occupy three clerks, at the highest salary, for 365 days, to complete.

Mr. *Hume* said, that when the reduction of the duty on Beer was proposed, it was said that it would occasion a reduction of the number of Excise Officers, but he understood that no such reduction had yet been made.

Motion deferred till Monday.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, Dec. 3.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By Lords KING, DURHAM, and WHARNCLIFFE, Earl GROSVENOR, the Bishop of LONDON, and the Marquis of BUTE, from Dissenters in various parts of the country, praying for the abolition of Negro Slavery. By Lord DURHAM, from St. Bride's, Camberwell, for the amendment of the Metropolitan Police Act. By the Duke of RICHMOND, from the Inhabitants of Clapham, Surrey, that they might not be included in the New Police Act.

On the Motion of Lord TENTERDEN, the Administration of Justice Act Amendment Bill went through a Committee.

COMPLAINT BY THE DUKE OF NEWCASTLE.] The Duke of *Newcastle* begged the attention of their Lordships for a few moments. Their Lordships were very well aware how disagreeable, how painful, how distressing, it was for him to address their Lordships upon any occasion. Their Lordships, therefore, might readily conceive what his feelings were in rising to address them upon a subject which regarded himself. He must, however, claim their Lordships' indulgence and attention for a few moments; and he hoped they would bear with him if he should be betrayed into using any expressions, while speaking of himself, which, under other circumstances, it would not become him to use, or them to listen to. He had to make a complaint to their Lordships. He would not put his complaint upon the ground of a breach of privilege—no, he would not shelter himself under that—but he must say, that he considered what had been said respecting himself,—which was what he had to complain to their Lordships of,

—was a gross libel upon his character, and tended, by the words used, to draw him into contempt. Now, therefore, he would come to the grounds of his complaint, and when he had stated the case, he should call upon their Lordships to judge between him and the circumstances of which he complained. Looking into *The Morning Chronicle* yesterday, he had found in it the report of a speech which was represented to have been made at Nottingham by no less a person than his Majesty's Attorney General. Perhaps, before he went further, he had better read the report to their Lordships from *The Morning Chronicle*. It was as follows:—"Nottingham Election.—Sir T. Denman, his Majesty's Attorney General, was re-elected a member for the town of Nottingham on Monday last. In the course of his speech to the electors, the learned gentleman, when alluding to his future conduct in Parliament, said, 'My sentiments as to vote by ballot are well known to you all; but if the majority of my constituents shall say that they cannot exercise their privilege of election without it, my support shall be given to it.'" Now he made no comment upon this, because his opinions, also, were well known on this subject. The report of the Attorney General's speech went on thus,—"I shall use my utmost endeavours against the boroughmongers. And I affirm to you, that the power which has called forth from a nobleman that 'scandalous' and 'wicked' interrogatory—'Is it not lawful for me to do what I please with my own?'—ought to be abolished by the law of the land. With respect to the other points, namely, the abolition of the Slave-trade and the Corn-laws, I can say, that the labours of the present Ministry will be directed to effect the former; and I hope that, although the Corn-laws must be abolished by degrees, the time will soon arrive when that, as well as every other trade, will be as free as nature and Providence can make it." Now the parts of this speech to which he (the Duke of Newcastle) alluded, and of which he had to complain to their Lordships was, the connexion between those consecutive sentences—"I will use my utmost efforts against the boroughmongers," and—"I affirm to you that the power which has called forth from a nobleman that scandalous and wicked interrogatory," and so forth. Now he had no doubt in his own mind, that, although he was not named in this speech, no other nobleman than himself could be meant; for, if he recollected rightly, he wrote that very sentence—"Is it not lawful for me to do what I please with my own?" He had thought that the proper course for him to pursue, therefore, was, to write to the Attorney General, which he had done; and in his letter he stated what he had seen in the *Morning Chronicle*, and asked of the Attorney General a distinct and explicit explanation, that was to say, meaning that the Attorney General should distinctly and explicitly acknowledge or deny having used this expression. He had received an answer from the Attorney General, which, however, he could not say was by any means explicit or distinct; for the Attorney General, it must be acknowledged, had used all the legal sinuosities and turnings that his skill could devise; but, in the end, the Attorney General said sufficient to identify his speech with the report. He considered, therefore, that he had a right to presume that the speech, as reported, was the speech which the Attorney General had made at Nottingham, since that learned Gentleman had not distinctly denied it. Presuming this, then, he begged to ask their Lordships if this was a proper course for the King's Attorney General to pursue? He begged to ask, if it was right for the King's Attorney General to come into the chief town of the county in which he resided,—of the county in which he had the honour to be the King's Lieutenant,—he begged, he said, to ask if it was right for the Attorney General to come into such a place and utter language respecting him, calculated to bring him into contempt, especially in such condition of affairs as that in which the country was now unfortunately placed? Was it decent, was it proper, in his Majesty's Attorney General, to use such language as this, which must always be offensive, and which, in the present case, was literally criminal towards him, considering how prone some persons were at this time to attack those who were situated as he had the honour to be? If he was a timid man he might, after language putting him as it were under the ban of the Government, be afraid to leave his own dwelling. Besides, he might have to act with his Majesty's Attorney General in this very county; for the Attorney General might have to prosecute those who were proceeded against for breaches of the law. He could not help feeling that he had not only been most improperly treated, by having had this language used towards him, but that that treatment was greatly aggravated by the language having proceeded from a servant of the Crown; and he felt assured that the noble Earl at the head of the Government would express to the Attorney General, in a marked manner, his sense of such conduct. He wished just to remark to their Lordships, that there had been exercised towards him a system—he would not say of persecution, for he hardly thought that any one would think it worth while to persecute him—but that there was a something in the manner in which he had been treated, by which it seemed that, while others were situated just in the same manner as himself, he was to be picked out to be abused and baited, and have his character lowered in every possible way. He was extremely sorry that the King's Attorney General should have joined in this vulgar cry against him, should have taken up the language of the vulgar multitude, and should have thought it became his office to cater for the feelings and appetites of the licentious. He was not ashamed to confess the confusion into which he always fell in addressing their Lordships; he was unused to making speeches at all, and very seldom attempted a speech of any length; so that it was very probable their Lordships might have great difficulty in making out what his real object was at the present time. He would, however, endeavour to make that object intelligible to their Lordships. He did not mean, that their Lordships should call his Majesty's Attorney General to account for these expressions; what he meant was, that he was ready to meet any charges which the Attorney General, or any other man, might have to prefer against him, for he neither feared the Attorney General nor any other man. If an open enemy attacked him, he would meet that enemy face to face; if an insidious enemy attacked him, he would meet that enemy in the best way he was able; but against all enemies he would defend himself; he would meet all his enemies as he might be able to meet them, and he would not allow himself to be abused and baited without exculpating himself. He had set his life upon the cast, and he gave all his enemies fair notice of it. He would not yield to any man in the country in attachment to the liberties of the country, and in determination to preserve by any means, even to the sacrifice of his life, those liberties. He had always been taught to value, and always had valued those liberties. He feared no man, for though he might be wrong in some things, yet, with these principles, he could not be very wrong, he was sure. He feared his God, and he honoured his King, and acting, to the best of his abilities, in conformity with this fear and this love, he cared nothing for consequences. While he was on his legs, let him profess, which he did with the greatest sincerity, the high respect he entertained for the noble Earl at the head of the Government. He was quite sure, that the noble Earl always endeavoured to act rightly, and would therefore justify the same course in others. He felt great confidence in the noble Earl, and he felt that the noble Earl had at once power to benefit—if he pleased to do so—the nation at large, and to save it from impending dangers. He thought the noble Earl was in possession of qualities to effect these great advantages more than any other man in the country. He would, therefore, beseech the noble Earl—whatever might be his opinions on the subject—to refrain from agitating the question of reform in the present state of the country. Under existing circumstances the agitation of that question must be productive of considerable excitement. If his voice could prevail with the noble Earl to adopt that course, he should rejoice from the bottom of his heart. He wished to see a strong Government—a very strong Government—and, without caring about the men who composed it, such a Government should have his support. He thought that, barring a few exceptions, there was not much difference between the noble Earl and himself. One of those exceptions was reform,—another, if the noble Earl was bent upon the course, was agitating that question now; for he must say, that he was firmly persuaded that his agitation of such a question, in such times, would be productive of the most mischievous consequences. He trusted, therefore, that the noble Earl would not bring it forward, at least for the present. He could not sit down without touching upon another matter connected with reform. In the report of the speech of the Attorney General, which he had read to their Lordships, some allusion was made to vote by ballot. Now he did hope that no Englishman would consent to admit anything so revolting, so debasing to the character of the nation, as vote by ballot. If Englishmen fought, they fought openly; if they acted, they acted openly; if they spoke, they spoke out and made themselves heard. Englishmen never pursued the conduct of the insidious assassin, whose measures were taken covertly and in the dark. He did, therefore, hope, that vote by ballot would be scouted by every respectable man in the country as altogether un-English, and uncharacteristic of their fellow-countrymen. He would not detain their Lordships any longer. He had thus attempted to express what he felt with regard to the attack which had been made upon him, and he threw himself upon their Lordships, and upon the country at large, to decide whether his feelings and his conduct were right or wrong. He had stated to their Lordships the nature of his complaint, and the grounds on which he complained. He left the matter, with full confidence, in the hands of their Lordships; and he had to express to their Lordships his heartfelt thanks for the attention with which they had listened to one so little worthy of the attention of their Lordships. He would only add, in conclusion, that he did hope the Attorney General, as long as he held the high office with which he was at present invested, would not take, on any future occasion, a part which was so incompatible with the duties of his station.

Earl *Grey* said, that after the direct and pointed allusions which the noble Duke had made to him personally, their Lordships would doubtless expect that he should say something upon the matter which the noble Duke had brought under the notice of their Lordships. He had risen, therefore, to address their Lordships, though he was free to confess he felt considerable difficulty in giving utterance to one word upon the matter, not having very distinctly understood what object the noble Duke had in view in bringing forward this matter of complaint, and still less understanding how it was possible that that House should take cognizance of the circumstance complained of. In one thing, however, he felt no difficulty at all, and that was, in returning to the noble Duke his best thanks for the very flattering manner in which the noble Duke had been pleased to express himself with regard to so humble an individual as himself. The noble Duke had said, that he had the power to save the country if he chose. Surely none of their Lordships could for a moment doubt, that if he had the power of benefitting the country, it would be at once his duty, his pride, and his delight, to exercise that power. He could not be insensible to the exaggeration of the estimate which the noble Duke had been pleased to make of his powers; but such as those powers were —and this, he was sure their Lordships would see, was all that, under the circumstances, he could say,—the noble Duke might be assured that they should be strained to the utmost in endeavouring to relieve the distresses, and to suppress the disturbances, which agitated the country. The noble Duke had alluded to the question of Reform in Parliament. This, however, was certainly not the time to enter into the general principles of that question, and still less to descant upon the particular details of any given plan of reform; and he should not, therefore, on the present occasion, allow himself to be drawn into a discussion upon the proposal of voting by ballot. He might, perhaps, have very strong objections to vote by ballot; but, upon that point, as upon all other details connected with the subject, he should reserve himself until a measure of reform had received the sanction of the other House of Parliament, where such a measure ought undoubtedly to originate, and then he would state why he gave his support to that measure, as well to the principle as to the details of it. With regard to the general principles of reform, he had,—he thought their Lordships would admit,—stated, already, as far as general principles could be stated, those which would meet with his approbation and support. He declined, therefore, saying any thing more upon the subject of reform, until the time to which he had alluded should have arrived,—except, indeed, with regard to a position which the noble Duke had laid down relative to bringing forward the question of reform at all in the present condition of the country. The noble Duke had expressed his conviction, that, to agitate the question, under existing circumstances, would be productive of mischievous consequences. Now, if he thought so,—if he could anticipate that such consequences would result from the agitation of the question,—he should be the last man in the country to bring it forward, or to join with any men who proposed to bring it forward; but his opinion was directly the reverse of that which had been expressed by the noble Duke—nay, his firm conviction was, that the only effectual means of quieting the country was, to bring the question of reform under the notice of the Legislature, and, that, too without more delay than was absolutely necessary. The noble Duke had said, that this was one of the subjects upon which difference of opinion existed between them, and in this the noble Duke had spoken most truly. He had imbibed his opinions of Parliamentary Reform at a very early age; he had held them constantly ever since; the experience of not a very short career had confirmed him in those opinions; and he repeated now what he had said to their Lordships at the commencement of the present Session,—that it was his firm conviction that the settlement of this important question could be no longer delayed. He believed that the time had at length arrived, at which they must fairly and fearlessly approach the consideration of that question, and endeavour to effect the settlement of it on rational principles,—which, if they did not,—which, if they delayed too long, might be settled in such a manner — might be carried on such principles—as would be accompanied with confusion and destruction. He would detain their Lordships with no further observations upon this topic, but would come now to the particular subject of which the noble Duke complained. He repeated, that he felt extreme difficulty in dealing with this matter, for he knew not how their Lordships could interfere in it, especially as the noble Duke had not proposed it to them as a matter of privilege; which, however, if the noble Duke had, still he (Earl Grey) should be at a loss to tell in what way that House could proceed. The noble Duke had told them that he had been ill-used; this they knew—but what redress the noble Duke asked, or what redress their Lordships could afford him, certainly neither of these was apparent. The noble Duke had yesterday stated to him the subject of his complaint, and he had expressed to the noble Duke his deep regret that the feelings of the noble Duke should have been wounded by such an occurrence. If the noble Duke had told him that he intended on this evening to call the attention of their Lordships to the circumstances, then he might have been prepared to say more upon it; but all that he could now say was, to repeat those expressions of regret which he had before made to the noble Duke, and to tell the noble Duke, that his Majesty's Attorney General was a man who stood high, not only in his (Earl Grey's) estimation, but in the estimation of the country at large, as a lawyer of the most eminent attainments, and as a man of the soundest principles, and of the most inflexible integrity. At the same time, however, let him remind the noble Duke, that it did not, by any means, appear that the expressions, of which the noble Duke complained, were used by the person to whom they were attributed in his capacity of Attorney General to the King, which was the main feature of the noble Duke's complaint, but that they were contained in a speech delivered at Nottingham by a candidate for the representation of the people of that town; and surely there was a vast difference between what was said by a person to his constituents, and by the same person in an official character. He must too, observe, that if every speech at an election which contained opinions at variance with those of any noble Lord, or which contained animadversions upon the conduct of any noble Lord, as a public man, were to be brought before this House by complaint, the time of their Lordships would not be very properly employed. However, he had not the least difficulty in saying, that he did not approve of the expression "boroughmongers," and that he should not himself be inclined to select individuals as marks for personal attacks, however opposed he might be to any system which those individuals, among others, upheld; but, with regard to this particular case, when he considered all the circumstances of it, he must say that, not approving of the expressions which were complained of, he could not help lamenting that declaration of the noble Duke's which had brought on him the strong condemnation of those who, without any disposition wantonly to hurt the feelings of the noble Duke personally, felt it their duty to express their sentiments strongly whenever they found the freedom of election impaired; for, by impairing the freedom of election, those persons were of opinion that there would result to the country the worst possible effects. Now, in this, and in no other view, could the Attorney General, he was persuaded, have meant to bring before the people of Nottingham that declaration of the noble Duke's; and if a declaration of that character had been made the subject of animadversion at an election, the noble Duke must lay it to the account that he was not, and could not expect to be, more exempt than any of the rest of their Lordships, from that which they were all of them compelled as public men to undergo from those who thought they acted wrong. But the noble Duke, allow him to say, had not opened to their Lordships the whole of the case. The noble Duke had said, that he had applied to the Attorney General for an explanation; an explanation, the noble Duke had told them, he had received, and he had described it as being replete with legal sinuosities, but the noble Duke had not produced that explanation to their Lordships. Now he must say, that if their Lordships were competent to entertain this complaint, which, however, he denied, for their Lordships were not, as it appeared to him, competent to take cognizance of the matter—it would be very unfair if their Lordships were to come to a decision upon it without seeing as well the terms of the demand for explanation as the terms of the explanation itself. He would trouble their Lordships with no further observations, and he was extremely sorry that he had been called upon to make these. He trusted that the noble Duke would see, that, under the circumstances, he had said all that could be reasonably expected from him upon the matter. He regretted exceedingly the occasion which had given rise to this discussion, and he assured the noble Duke that he was extremely sorry his feelings should have been thus wounded; but, at the same time, he must repeat, that he not only could not approve, but that he felt great regret at the publication of that unfortunate declaration which had drawn upon him those animadversions of which he complained. He trusted that their Lordships would hear no more upon the subject, but that they would pass at once to the Orders of the Day,—there being no question before the House.

The Duke of *Newcastle* said, that he would have read the communication from the Attorney General, to which the noble Earl had alluded, but that he thought their Lordships would have considered it improper in him to do so. As to the object he had in view in bringing this matter under the notice of the House, he expected no other result from it, but to show that he was ready to meet any charges that any one had to prefer against him; and as he did not think that he had acted wrongly, he could not suffer himself to lie under imputations from the Attorney General, or from any one else. He had been abused, and he had been called by he knew not how many opprobrious names, and he therefore wished to throw himself upon the judgment of their Lordships, and ask their Lordships to decide whether he had acted rightly or wrongly.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that it was impossible for him to suffer this conversation to drop without offering a few observations to their Lordships, though he believed that it was most irregular, as the noble Duke who had commenced it had not followed it up by any motion. Indeed he did not see how any of the circumstances to which the noble Duke had alluded could be made the foundation of any motion in that House. He would therefore commence by avowing that what occasioned him to rise at that moment was, his decided conviction that the noble Duke had been misinformed as to the words made use of by his learned friend, the King's Attorney General. If he had been acquainted beforehand with the intention of the noble Duke to make those words the subject of discussion before their Lordships, he could have satisfied the noble Duke, irritable though he might be on this subject; and he could have appeased the noble Duke's feeling of irritation, natural as it was, by the statement of a few facts, which he now felt himself bound to lay before their Lordships, in strict justice not only to his learned friend, the King's Attorney General, but also to the noble Duke, who felt himself aggrieved by his learned friend's observations. He agreed with his noble friend, that what a gentleman said before his constituents, as a candidate for their renewed suffrages, was—he would not say, to be taken with greater latitude of interpretation and to be visited with greater indulgence than the deliberate declaration of his opinions,—but he would say, that it was not to be confounded with what the King's Attorney General might declare in the discharge of his official duty. When he saw yesterday evening,—for then was the first time that his attention was directed to the paragraph in the newspaper,—when he saw yesterday evening the paragraph of which the noble Duke had just made complaint, he felt, he admitted, great pain, but he likewise felt no doubt that the words of his hon. and learned friend, the King's Attorney General, had been misrepresented, knowing that they were very different from the tone and temper of his general observations. Still, though he had no doubt as to the misrepresentation, he felt great pain that his hon. and learned friend should be charged with the use of such offensive and unbecoming expressions. He was certain, from his long and intimate acquaintance with his learned friend, that he, even on a subject on which he felt strongly, was the last person who would be capable of forgetting the respect due, not only to the noble Duke, but also to himself, so far as to have uttered expressions like those which had been put by the newspaper into his mouth. He had accordingly taken the liberty of requesting an interview with his hon. and learned friend that morning. The interview was granted. He had then taken the liberty of asking his hon. and learned friend whether he had seen the paragraph in question. His hon. and learned friend replied, that he had seen it, and added, that in some places it was a gross perversion of what he had said, and that in others, where it was not a perversion, it was a gross exaggeration of the language which he had used. His hon. and learned friend then laid before him an account of what he believed and recollected himself to have said to the electors of Nottingham, coupled with what to him (the Lord Chancellor) was an unnecessary voucher, that he had made that statement before an old friend of his, also in the law, who had accompanied him down to Nottingham, who had been present on the hustings when he addressed the electors, who had been close by his side all the time that he was speaking, and who had heard every word that he had uttered. That gentleman was a person of peculiarly accurate and retentive memory, and was known to all the profession to excel eminently in that faculty. He had given his confirmation to the statement which his hon. and learned friend had laid before him as containing that which he thought and believed and recollected himself to have said. If he had thought that he should be called upon—as in justice to his old and much valued, friend the King's Attorney General, he was now called upon—to make any statement as to the language which his hon. and learned friend had used, he would have come down to the House furnished with that short paper which contained his actual observations, as vouched by the learned Gentleman who had gone down with him to Nottingham. He could not from the newspaper, which contained the misrepresentations, pretend to state to their Lordships what his hon. and learned friend actually had said: but this he could state,—which would be as satisfactory he trusted to the noble Duke as it was to his hon. and learned friend the Attorney General,—that the only offensive part of that paragraph, of which the noble Duke had a right to complain,—for the noble Duke must lay his account to meet with that censure which was the lot of all other public characters, and from which he ought] not to expect to be more exempt than any of their Lordships,—the only part of that paragraph which was deficient in that respect which was always due from one gentleman to another, was not uttered by his hon. and learned friend, the King's Attorney General. No allusion whatever had been made by his hon. and learned friend to the noble Duke by name. So far was his hon. and learned friend from having mentioned the name of the noble Duke, that he had not even gone so far as to say that a nobleman or a gentleman had made such and such an observation. A phrase used by the noble Duke certainly had been commented on,—and why not? The noble Duke, however, was not the only person who had used that phrase—it had been adopted by others, who had followed his example. He would deal candidly with the noble Duke, and would avow to him distinctly, that he did not admire this part of his conduct, though there were other parts of it which he considered manly, disinterested, and honourable in a high degree. He admitted that on the phrase first used by the noble Duke, and afterwards employed by those who had followed his example, his hon. and learned friend had made a comment, as he had a perfect right to do. No person was pointed out by name in that comment, and the words "scandalous and wicked," which formed the only offensive part of the paragraph, were not only not used by his hon. and learned friend, but there was not even a synonyme employed for them of the like meaning or tendency, although there was undoubtedly a clear and distinct disapproval expressed of the measures pursued by the noble Duke. This was satisfactory to his mind, and he trusted that it would prove equally satisfactory to the noble Duke. If the noble Duke had seen, as he had done, the words actually used by his hon. and learned friend, he was sure that the noble Duke would acknowledge that he had no right, as a public man, to feel hurt by them, much less to make them the subject of a formal complaint to their Lordships. He thought it right to say thus much to their Lordships, in justice to the noble Duke, and in justice to his hon. and learned friend, the Attorney General, who was not, and, indeed, could not be present to defend himself. Besides the disavowal of his hon. and learned friend, there were other circumstances which induced him to believe that his hon. and learned friend could not have used the expressions imputed to him. He had no doubt, that what the Attorney-General was said to have added, respecting the intentions of Government with regard to our colonial system—observations by which the noble Duke thought that his hon. and learned friend had committed the Government, of which he was a member,—had never been uttered; and that for this reason—that at the time when that speech was made, the new Government had not entered upon the consideration of, much less taken any resolution upon, that important subject. He supposed that, owing to the crowd and hurry which prevailed about the hustings, his learned friend's observations had not been reported with that accuracy which generally distinguished the reports in the public papers.

The Duke of *Newcastle*: I think it right to state to the noble Earl at the head of the Administration, that at the time of the interview which I had with him yesterday, I had no intention to do that which I have done now. It was only this morning that I took the resolution of acting as I have now done.

The subject dropped.

Regency Bill.] On the Report of this Bill being brought up, Lord *Lyndhurst* moved to add a clause to the Bill to the following effect:—That in the case of the Duchess of Kent's becoming Regent, and the Princess Victoria desiring to marry before she attained the age of eighteen, she should not be permitted to marry a foreigner without the consent of the two Houses of Parliament; and that in case the Duchess of Kent should marry a foreigner in the life-time of his Majesty, but without his consent, she should by that Act forfeit all pretensions to the Regency under this Bill.—Clause agreed to.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, Dec. 6.

Minutes.] Petitions presented. For the abolition of Slavery, by the Earls of Eldon and Grosvenor, the Duke of Richmond, the Bishop of Llandaff, and Lord Wharncliffe, from Wolverhampton, Stirling, Cardigan, Halifax, from the Females of Christchurch, Hants, from Loughborough, and several other places. By Lord King, from Wm. Cobbett, for a Reformation of the Poor-laws, for a repeal of all the Taxes on the necessaries of life, particularly the Assessed Taxes and the Excise, and for the abolition of Tithes. By the Marquis of Clanricarde, from Westport, for the continuance of the bounties on Fishing; and from the Catholics of Ballinasloe, and other places, praying for a better distribution of the Funds granted to the Kildare-place Education Society. By Earl Gower, from the Staffordshire Potteries, against the Truck System. By the Duke of Richmond, from Hargood Snook, of Portsea, for an extension of the Elective Franchise.

Regency Bill.] Lord Lyndhurst moved the Order of the Day for the third reading of this Bill.

The *Lord Chancellor* wished to take that opportunity to state an important circumstance connected with the principle of this Bill. It appeared that the whole of the arrangements of this measure were such as to meet the exigency of the occasion, while they were so framed as to steer clear of the various conflicting interests connected with such an important question. As the principle upon which this Bill was founded, was capable, and likely, of being drawn into a precedent in after times, it was necessary and fitting that the measure should go down to posterity clear of all doubt and uncertainty, not only as to its arrangements, but also as to the observations and arguments which might have been stated in reference to it by any person either there or elsewhere. It had been said, he believed, that this was a case entirely of the first impression, and that this Bill was framed upon no ordinary principle, much less in accordance with any example to be found in the former periods of our history. He thought it right, therefore, if there was an example to be found which, though not exactly, yet substantially bore out the principle of the present measure, that such an example should not be withdrawn from the attention of their Lordships and of the public. He concurred with the statement of his noble and learned friend who had introduced this Bill, that there was no direct precedent to be found for the principle of it in the history of England. He had, however, been referred by a learned friend of his, a member of the legal profession, to a case which bore greatly upon the present measure, and he conceived it his duty to inform their Lordships, of the particulars of that case. It was satisfactory to be enabled to state to their Lordships, that that case was disposed of both by France and England, who had a common interest in the decision of the question, precisely in the same way that his noble and learned friend had disposed of the present case. He alluded to a period so far back as the reign of Henry 2nd. The son of that King, Geoffrey, Duke of Brittany, held his dukedom as a fief under the Duke of Normandy, who was likewise King of England; but the claim of Lord Paramount was set up by the King of France, both Normandy and Brittany heing held of him. Geoffrey died, leaving his widow *enceinte*, and a daughter Eleanor, but no son. On his death two rival claims were put up for the wardship of his daughter Eleanor, and it would be seen that, in the proceedings to which they gave rise, the principle of the present measure was admitted by both claimants. Philip Augustus of France, as Lord Paramount, put in his claim to the guardianship of Eleanor, the Duchess of Brittany, and Henry 2nd put in his claim, as Duke of Normandy, and therefore superior Lord of Brittany, to the guardianship of his granddaughter. Both the claimants acknowledged Eleanor to be Duchess of Brittany, though her mother was *enceinte* at the time. Now, according to the doctrine which had been broached elsewhere, allegiance was due not to Eleanor, but to the child *en ventre sa mere*. That was not the principle upon which the rival claimants in this instance acted. They held that the allegiance was due, not to the child *en ventre sa mere*, but to the eldest born child of Geoffrey, to whom, as in cases of real property, the possession at once passed. Eleanor being the eldest born child of Geoffrey, they acknowledged at once her right to the Duchy of Brittany, at the same time admitting that that right was defeasible (and this was the point upon which he wished to show that that case approached so nearly to the principle of the present measure)—at once and instantaneously defeasible by the subsequent birth of a child, if that child should happen to be a son. Their Lordships were aware that his Majesty's Government, who had introduced this measure, had brought it forward, founded distinctly upon those two principles; they said that no allegiance was due to the child *en ventre sa mere*, but to the eldest born child, and that that right, as vested in a female, was defeasible by the subsequent birth of a male child. But they, it seemed, were not the first to assert those principles. How did the parties act in the case to which he had drawn their Lordships' attention? In the course of a few months, Constance, the widow of Geoffrey, was delivered of a son —a son who was well known, unfortunately, in the history of this country, and whose name did not belong alone to the history, but to the drama of the country too; for he had been immortalized by Shakspeare. That son, Prince Arthur, who was subsequently murdered by his uncle, King John, became at once Duke of Brittany. The moment he was born the defeasance of the title of his sister took place, and at once an end was put to the dispute between Henry 2nd and Philip Augustus, and to the preparations for a war which was about taking place between them, to settle the question with regard to Eleanor. The birth of Arthur at once produced a defeasance of the title of his sister to the duchy, and that settled the question which had been raised between the two kings with respect to her wardship. That portion of our history which was connected with the fate of Arthur was involved in much obscurity. All that was known with certainty of it was, that Prince Arthur came subsequently into the possession of his uncle, King John, who murdered him some years after. Eleanor was also carried away by him to this country, and placed in captivity somewhere in Wales, and she was succeeded in the possession of the Duchy of Brittany by her sister Alice, the daughter of Constance by a second marriage. It was satisfactory and gratifying to find that the present instance was not the only one in which the principle of this Bill had been acted upon.

Here was proof that the principle upon which his noble and learned friend had founded this measure, had been distinctly adopted and acknowledged by the learned feudalists of France and of England so early as the time of Henry 2nd. The discovery of that precedent removed all doubts and obviated all objections, and he cordially approved of the Bill.

The Bill read a third time, and passed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, Dec. 6.

MINUTES.] Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. BELL, the quantity of Coals exported within the last year, and the amount of Duty paid thereon, distinguishing the Exports made in Foreign, from those made to British Ships:—On the Motion of Sir R. PEEL, the money levied for Poor, County, and other Rates, according to papers prepared with great care and ingenuity by Mr. Rickman:—On the Motion of Mr. S. RICE, of the number of persons employed under the Commissioners of public Records, and the charges incurred for publishing them:—On the Motion of Colonel SIBTHORPE, the number of Convictions for Adulterating Beer, in England and Wales, since the year 1827; and of the Informations ordered by the Board of Excise on the same subject within the same period:—On the Motion of Mr. RUTHVEN, of the number of Summonses and Decrees issued by the Court of Conscience (Dublin), during the last three years:—On the Motion of Mr. WARBURTON, of the number of Commitments for Capital Crimes in Middlesex, from May 1827, to April 1830.

Petitions presented. For the abolition of Negro Slavery, by Sir E. KNATCHBULL, from Footscray, Ashford, and Woolwich:—By Sir C. LEMON, from Meneage, Cornwall:—By Mr. LITTLETON, from seven places in the County of Salop:—By Mr. J. BROWN, from Newbridge and Westport:—By Mr. BROWNLOW, from Boyle and another Town in Iretand:—By Mr. BELL, from Holywell, Wallsend, and other places:—By Mr. LOCH, from Kirkwall and Stromness:—By Mr. CALLAGHAN, from the City of Cork:—By Mr. MUNDY, from three places in Derbyshire:—By Sir R. B. PHILIPPS, from the Parish of King's Castle, and four other places:—By Mr. H. DRUMMOND, from the Borough and Corporation of Stirling:—By Mr. ADEANE, from a place in the County of Cambridge:—By Mr. OWEN, from Ford, and other places in Pembrokeshire:—By Mr. BETHELL, from Rothwell:—By Mr. DENISON, from Dorking. By Mr. J. BROWNE, from the Parishes of Kilmena, Kilcoleman, Kilgeeva, for an equal distribution of the Funds destined to promote Education in Ireland; from Kilbride, for amendment of the Grand Jury Laws; and from Westport, for a continuation of Bounties on curing Fish. By Mr. H. DAVIS, from the Parishes of St. James, St. Mary, St. Thomas, and St. Peter, Bristol, praying for the Repeal of the House and Window Tax. For the Repeal of the Metropolis Police Act, by Mr. DENISON, from St. Giles', Camberwell:—By Mr. C. CALVERT, from St. George the Martyr, Southwark. By Mr. WIGRAM, from Wexford, for the Repeal of the Sugar Duties. By Mr. HODGES, from the Owners and Occupiers of Land in the County of Kent, and from certain Inhabitants of Appledore, Kent, complaining of Distress, and calling on the House to investigate the present extravagant system of Tithes. By Lord KILLEEN, from Dunsaney and other places in Ireland, praying for the Repeal of the Subletting and Vestry Acts; and from Nun's Island, in the County of Galway, praying for the extension of the Elective Franchise. By Mr. DALRYMPLE, from Haddington, for Burgh Reform.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.] Mr. *Brownlow* presented a Petition from the Town of Armagh, praying for Parliamentary Reform. He stated, that the persons who had signed the petition constituted the most respectable and intelligent portion of the inhabitants of that town, and the conduct of the meeting, at which the petition was agreed to, was most rational and moderate. The petitioners, amongst other allegations, complained that, under the present mode of election, those who possess the right of suffrage are compelled to vote at the will of their landlords, or other powerful persons, for the candidate of whom they do not approve; and they believed that the independence of voters might be effectually maintained if the vote were taken by ballot. He thought it right to mention that the petitioners had requested the members for the county of Armagh to transfer the petition to the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Hume) if they themselves could not support its prayer. Now, for his part, he (Mr. Brownlow) could not be induced to make up his mind, 'on the spur of the moment' for the gratification of presenting any petition; and, therefore, if his mind had not already been made up on the subject of that petition, he would have declined to present it. But as he had considered the matter, and entirely concurred in the statements of the petitioners respecting the necessity of the ballot, he found no difficulty in presenting and supporting their petition. He was anxious that every man who had the right to vote should be enabled to use that right in accordance with his conscience.

Mr. *Cresset Pelham* supported the Petition. He was convinced that the representation throughout was corrupt, and he hoped to see that House entirely reformed.

Lord *Acheson*, was fully aware how unacceptable any discussion upon the subject of a petition was to that House, but, circumstanced as he was with regard to the petition which had just been presented by his hon. friend and colleague, he trusted that he might be permitted to say a few words upon it. The meeting at which that petition originated, came to a resolution, that it should be intrusted to the Members for the county, provided they would give it their support, otherwise that it should be sent to the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Hume). His hon. friend and colleague consented to support it; he, on the contrary, declined doing so, and he felt it his duty—

a duty he owed to those who sent him there—not to let this petition pass without stating his reasons for dissenting from it. It was not his intention to enter at all upon the general subject of reform, but this much he must say, that the abuses which had crept into the representative system of this country were so numerous, and his conviction of the necessity of their speedy removal was so firm, that he had no hesitation in avowing himself a decided friend of reform. He looked to the present Government to do much in this respect, the country expected it of them; and he, for one, should give his most cordial support to any measure they might bring forward tending to reform the Parliament, so far as he could do so without compromising the spirit and integrity of the Constitution. Among all these abuses, he knew not one which it would be found more difficult to remove, nor one which called more loudly for correction, than the undue influence at present exercised over the votes of electors. No man was more anxious than he was, to see freedom of election existing in substance and reality, —not, as now, a mere empty name. But how was that to be effected? Undue influence might be gradually diminished; the evil might, to a certain extent, be remedied, but how it was to be totally eradicated he knew not. He was told, indeed, that to vote by ballot would effect all this; for that it would establish secrecy and security for the voter. In considering this subject, his first inquiry naturally was, how that could be proved? He must confess, that he had not succeeded in this inquiry at all to his satisfaction. The assertion was every where made, arguments were founded upon it, but he saw nothing to satisfy him that the assertion itself was well founded. The voter might conceal the actual fact of his vote at the time of delivering it, but of what avail was this secrecy, unless it was to be followed by security afterwards; for he could hardly call that a state of security in which a man lives, as it were, by a perpetual falsehood, and in continual fear, lest by a breach of confidence in some friend, to whom in an unguarded moment he may have disclosed the truth, or by some other chance, the whole should come to the ear of the landlord, and his total ruin should ensue. He did not wish to enlarge upon the subject of security. He owned that a speech made last Session by an hon. and learned Member, now a noble Lord, holding a high and important situation elsewhere, was to him very satisfactory in proving the extreme improbability of the existence of that security. The landlords would use every endeavour to obtain the promises of the votes of their tenants for themselves or their friends, and if disappointed in the result, after having received these promises, that they would make every exertion to discover the defaulters he had not the slightest doubt; and as he conceived it to be more difficult for a man to adhere continually to a falsehood than to avoid, by some chance or other, the letting out the truth, he had little doubt of their general success. At all events, the system of chicanery, trick, and perjury, and the total destruction of all confidence between landlord and tenant which would arise from this measure, were, in his opinion, serious objections to its introduction. In addition to this, bribery would still exist. Though it might no longer be worth a man's while to bribe individually, corruption would still have its effect when applied collectively. It would be easy to say to a number of voters, "If I succeed, or my friend, (whichever it might happen to be), such a sum of money shall be distributed among you." Those who would take a bribe now would do so then, and the ballot would fail to put a stop to the influence of money. In corroboration of this, he must beg leave to state to the House a fact, which had come to his knowledge within the last few days, and which he considered to be of the greatest importance; it was the opinion of a very high American authority now in this country, asserting, that not only had vote by ballot failed in the United States to counteract corrupt and authoritative influence, but that such corruption and such influence still existed, and were frequently and effectually exerted; and that, with regard to secresy, it had by no means been established by this system of voting. That high republican authority ought to have weight with those who advocated this principle upon popular grounds. He believed that he was speaking before some Gentlemen, decided friends of vote by ballot, who were acquainted with those opinions, and also with the quarter from whence they sprung. He felt that he had said enough to authorize him to dissent from the petition now before the House. He should not now trouble the House by offering his opinion as to the probable effects of this measure in Ireland. Suffice it to say, that in addition to the general objections he had mentioned,—objections which would apply to either country—there were other and most important objections to this measure, which would more particularly apply to Ireland, and which he should take another opportunity of stating to the House. He should only add, that as a warm friend of reform, he was sorry to be obliged to dissent from the prayer of the petition. Though he differed from his hon. friend and colleague as to the remedy, no man agreed with him more fully than he did as to the existence of the disease, nor could be more anxious than he was to see it removed. His opinions on this subject had not been hastily formed; still they were those of a young man, and he trusted that, whenever he was proved to be in the wrong, he should have the candour to come forward and acknowledge his error. At all events, he should always feel it his duty to turn his attention to any measure which might have freedom of election for its object; and most gratified should he be if he met with a plan which should hold out a reasonable probability of success.

Mr. *O'Connell* had been solicited to support the petition. There were few boroughs in which the franchise was limited in a manner more grievous and unconstitutional than in the town of Armagh. The right of voting was possessed by only twelve inhabitants, and they held offices in the Corporation, to which they were appointed by an ecclesiastical dignitary. He complimented the noble Lord (Acheson) for his talents, and for the candour with which he had stated his opinions. In answer to the noble Lord's objection, that the ballot, without some more effectual security, would not promote the independence of the vote, he (Mr. O'Connell) must say, that, if so, it would at all events not make matters worse than they are. In fact, allowing the utmost force to the noble Lord's objection, the ballot could not fail to do some good. If it could not effect the concealment of all the votes, it could not fail to conceal a great number. Secresy would be secured, at least for those voters who stood in need of it. As to what had been said respecting the inefficacy of the ballot in America, it should be borne in mind that there can be no very extensive corruption of voters in that country, for the share which any man can possibly obtain of public plunder by a seat in Congress, is too little to induce him to lay out a sum of money for the chance of it. The noble Lord might have found in a neighbouring country an illustration of the efficiency of the ballot. He was fully convinced that France owed to the ballot the rejection of the fatal Ordinances. He believed, that the protection which the electors of France found in the ballot had secured the liberty of Europe; and he believed, that to the same cause the people of England owed the prospect of reform which was now held out to them. He was much gratified to hear the noble Lord express himself in favour of reform; and he had no doubt, that when that young nobleman should apply his reason to the consideration of the whole subject, the reformers would receive his powerful support in their efforts to obtain universal suffrage with the protection of the ballot.

Sir *H. Bunbury* supported the petition, and expressed his hope that Gentlemen who had frequently advocated the cause of reform and retrenchment in that House, and who now had the power of promoting it by their exertions in the other House, and by the influence of the Government, would set a noble example by the surrender of their own patronage. He expressed himself favourable to the vote by ballot, and declared that it was necessary for the national security that measures should be taken as speedily as possible to reform the Parliament. He also expressed his confidence in the Ministry, but he was firmly persuaded that no Ministry could remain in office who did not pluck up corruption by the roots.

Petition to lie on the Table.

REPEAL OF THE UNION.] Lord *Brabazon* presented Petitions from the inhabitants of Bray, in the county of Wicklow; of Grange Gorman, in the county of Dublin; and of other places in Ireland; and from the Carpet Weavers of the City of Dublin, praying for a Repeal of the Act of Union of Great Britain and Ireland. The noble Lord could not support the prayer of the petitioners. He was convinced that the measure which they desired would, if carried into effect, involve Ireland in civil commotions and in bloodshed. Perhaps some partial benefit might be derived to the City of Dublin from being again the seat of the Irish Legislature; but much as he desired to promote the welfare of that City, with which his interests were closely connected, he could not do so at the sacrifice of the national welfare. He expressed his regret that the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. O'Connell), whose exertions had already done so much good for Ireland, should exert his great talents and his powerful influence in the pursuit of an object so chimerical, or, if attainable, so pernicious, as the Repeal of the Union.

Mr. *O'Ferrall* presented a similar Petition from the inhabitants of Naas, in the County of Kildare, also complaining of extreme distress, which the petitioners attributed chiefly to the consequences of that Act. The hon. Gentleman could not support the petition, which, however, he had thought it his duty to present. The petitioners thought that a repeal of the Union, would produce a Reform of Parliament, and an amendment of the tithe system; but he hoped that these objects would be effected without the repeal of the Union, and he had great confidence that the present Ministry would do much for the country.

Mr. *O'Connell*, at the request of the petitioners, supported their prayer. He stated that there were in that town, amongst a population of 4,000, more than 1,200 persons depending wholly on casual charity for their support. He concurred in the statement of the petitioners, that the Union was the principal cause of their distress. That measure had greatly increased the evils of absenteeism, to which, during the existence of the Irish Parliament, an effectual check had been put by the imposition of a tax of seventy-five per cent upon the property of absentees; which tax was levied for several years previous to the Union. He hoped to see the day when such a tax would again be imposed. At present Ireland paid a tribute of 8,000,000*l.* a-year to England, in the revenue she remitted to absentee proprietors. Next to absenteeism, he considered the extravagantly expensive Church Establishment a principal source of the misery of the people. Those two causes, together with the oppressive taxation, produced in Ireland a degree of distress and suffering unparalleled in any other country. The hon. and learned gentleman presented petitions in favour of a Repeal of the Union, from the Sedan-chairmen of Dublin, and from the Bricklayers and House-smiths of that City. These persons felt severely the effects of the Union of the two countries. At the time of that Union there were 1,800 public, and 600 private Chairmen in that City; at present there were not more than twenty public Chairs, and one private. The mention of the parties from whom these petitions came might create merriment in the House, but he must say, that the present was not the moment when the petitions of any portion of the people ought to be laughed at. The hon. and learned Member presented a similar petition from the Corporation of Tuam, signed by the 'Sovereign.' The petitioners begged the House not to give credit to any statement which might be made to them from any quarter, that the great mass of the people of Galway were not favourable to a repeal of the Union. The hon. and learned Gentleman, after presenting similar petitions from parishes in Cork, Waterford, and Longford, adverted to what had been stated on a former evening, as to the opinion of the late Mr. Grattan, that the Union of the two countries, once passed, was irrevocable, and read an extract of a letter from that Gentleman, dated October 4th, 1810, in which he stated, that he would accede to the wish of parties who had intrusted him with a petition for the repeal of the Union, and would support its prayer, because he wished the connexion between the two countries should be more firm. This was also his (Mr. O'Connell's) humble opinion; but Mr. Grattan thought it would not be prudent to bring a Motion forward for the repeal until it was supported by the general voice of the people of Ireland. In this he also concurred; hon. Gentlemen did not seem to be aware of the extent to which the Anti-union feeling prevailed in Ireland. Anti-union meetings were spreading every where; and he might say, that in three of the provinces, ninety-nine out of every hundred were in favour of the repeal; and it was worthy of remark, that as those meetings spread, meetings of White-boys and other illegal associations disappeared, so sanguine were the people in the hope that a repeal of the Union and a resident Legislature would be the means of affording them relief.

Sir *J. Bourke* hoped, that as he was the individual whose statement as to the opinion of the people of Galway, on the subject of the Union, was alluded to, he might be allowed to say a word in explanation of that statement. He was asked on the hustings, when proposed for the county of Galway, whether he would vote for a repeal of the Union, and he distinctly stated, that he was opposed to that measure. He had a right therefore to infer, as his opinion was not then opposed, that it was not at variance with that of the county which returned him. It was however true that the people of Galway had not at that time had the advantage of being enlightened by the letters which the hon. and learned member for Waterford had since written on the subject, the publication of which he owned he viewed with regret.

Sir *John Newport* rose for the purpose of showing, that the most strenuous opposers of the Union in the Irish Parliament were clearly of opinion that, once completed, it was indissoluble. He wished to call the attention of the House to a letter from the predecessor of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite in the representation of the county of Waterford. [The right hon. Baronet then read an extract from the letter in question, distinctly showing, that the opinion of that Gentleman was directly adverse to any agitation of the question of a repeal of the Union at the present moment, or at any time; for he had never ceased to regard that measure as irrevocable.] Such was the opinion, he also stated, of all the public men at the period when that measure was agreed to. Both from their speeches in Parliament, and from the evidence which remained of their private meetings, there could not be a shadow of doubt that Mr. Ponsonby, Chief Justice Bushe, Lord Plunkett, Lord Oriel, and all the great men of that period agreed, that if the measure were once carried, the idea of repealing it would be perfectly visionary. He hesitated not to say, that he himself had always looked upon the Union as irrevocable. He was old enough to remember the proceedings of that local Parliament which it was thus vainly sought to restore; and he could well remember that the country under its government, was in such a state of confusion and anarchy that he believed it could no where else be paralleled—the country was in such a state that no peaceable man could live in it. He deprecated most earnestly the agitation of the question of the Union, for he looked on it as sure to produce results which could not fail to alarm English capitalists, and deter them from investments calculated to create employment for the people. He would, let the consequences be what they might, repeat his conscientious conviction against the proposition for a repeal. He was aware that in expressing his opinion against the repeal, he was stating that which was contrary to the opinions of a respectable portion of his constituents, and he had been intrusted with a petition signed by several of them in one parish in the city of Waterford, in which they called upon him to surrender his opinion on this subject to that of his constituents. Such a call he never could obey. He had for fifty years of his public life expressed his opinion freely, conscientiously, and independently, on all occasions, and he would not now depart from that consistency which he had ever maintained. Let the duration of his public life be long or short—and in the course of nature it could not now be much longer—he would continue to act in the same independent manner. If his constituents thought proper to withdraw their confidence in him, they had only to express that wish, and he would resign his trust into their hands; but, so long as he held it, he would vote according to the best of his judgment on every subject, without reference to any consideration but that which, he trusted, always had and ever would operate with him—that of promoting whatever tended most to the good of the country. In this feeling he never could support the repeal of the Union, unless it could be proved that such a measure would be to the benefit of Ireland; but, that he believed, could never be proved.

Mr. *A. Lefroy*, alluding to the petition which had been presented from a parish in the county which he had the honour to represent, said, that he could not support the prayer of that petition. He did not deny that the signatures to it were numerous and respectable; but he must say, that he had received letters from most respectable individuals, Protestants and Catholics, in that county, expressing their decided hostility to any such measure. If he had taken a course similar to that of the hon. member for Waterford, he might have got up a petition, most numerously and respectably signed, against the measure; but his great wish was, to do every thing which could unite both parties, and to encourage that disposition which would tend to promote the prosperity of all. He did not mean to say, that distress did not exist in Ireland, but he felt convinced that if the cause and nature of that distress, and the means of removing it, were fairly put forward, it would stand a much better chance of relief from a united Parliament than from a Parliament resident in Ireland.

Mr. *O'Connell*, in moving that the petitions do lie on the Table, said, that the statement made by the right hon. member for the city of Waterford had not met his case as to the opinion of the late Mr. Grattan. As to what had fallen from the hon. Member who had just sat down, about the union of Protestant and Catholic, he must say, that the repeal of the Union would, more than any other measure, tend to unite all parties. He added, that he had lately received a vote of thanks at a public meeting, which was moved by an Orangeman and seconded by a gentleman who was secretary to an Orange-lodge. The hon. Member, after a warm eulogy on the public conduct and consistency of the right hon. Baronet (Sir J. Newport), expressed his regret at hearing from such a respectable source the opinion which had been given as to the last Parliament of Ireland; but he must say, that except during the last six years, when that Parliament had been corrupted to carry the Union, it had shown as much independence as any Parliament that ever met. During the twelve years prior to the last six, it had five times defeated the plans of Ministers, and carried its own point in favour of the country, which could not be said of any Parliament that had sat since the Union. In conclusion, he observed, that the petitions for a repeal of the Union could not be put down by clamour within or without that House. He imputed no improper motive to any person who opposed this repeal, and any motives attributed to him he despised.

The Petitions to lie on the Table.

Division of Legal Appointments.] Mr. *O'Connell* moved for a return of the number and names of persons who had been sent out in judicial capacities to the East Indies and the British colonies, from the 1st of January, 1801, to the present time, with the dates of their appointment, the amount of salary, and, as nearly as could be made out, the amount of their other emoluments, and the Bar, whether English, Irish, or Scotch, to which they respectively belonged. He called for this information, because he believed that, since the Union, there had been but three appointments from the Irish Bar.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* said, that in his knowledge of five Advocates-general that had been sent out to India, two were Irish. The only persons who had reason to complain (the Irish having a fair share in those appointments) were the Scotch. He repeated, though it was not generally so supposed, that no persons had more reason than the Scotch to complain of exclusion from judicial offices.

Motion agreed to.

Vice-treasurer of Ireland.] Mr *O'Connell* wished to put a question to his hon. friend opposite, relative to the situation of Vice-treasurer of Ireland. Amongst the papers laid on the Table, there was a Treasury Minute relative to that office, which it had been proposed to abolish. But on looking at the Act of Parliament, he found that the office, under the provisions of the Statute, could not be abolished. He therefore requested to know what was meant to be done.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that though the office could not be abolished, still the contemplated saving would be effected. At present the Vice-treasurer had 2,000*l.* a year, there was a deputy at 800*l.* a year, and an establishment. The Government, in effecting a reduction, had made this arrangement. They found that the deputy Vice-treasurer had for many years acted also as Chief Clerk in the Irish department of the Treasury here at 1,000*l.* a year, and they proposed that that gentleman should execute the duties of the Vice-treasurer, which he had acceded to, for an additional sum of 200*l.* a year. The salaries of Vice-treasurer and of the deputy being discontinued, the entire saving would be 2,600*l.* per annum. They could not abolish the office of Vice-Treasurer, for that was fixed by an Act of Parliament. He was also Auditor of the Pells and of Taxes; and an Act of Parliament would be necessary for the purpose of doing away with the office. The Government had already done something, but what it was disposed to do would not rest there; for it would be the duty of the gentleman who was to fill the office to inquire what other savings could be made, and what number of clerks could be dispensed with, and if possible still greater reductions should be effected.

Parliamentary Reform.] Mr. *O'Connell* presented a Petition from John Howard, of Portarlington, for Parliamentary Reform, stating, that out of a population of 5,000 or 6,000 in that borough, there were only fourteen persons entitled to vote. The hon. Member added, that he was satisfied with the statement of his hon. friend as to the office of Vice-treasurer of Ireland; but much of his present labour in other departments might be easily transferred to two Prothonotaries, who were receiving large salaries with but slight duties attached to them. He had now also to present four petitions for Reform—one from Glastonbury, signed by Mr. H. Hunt, as lord of that manor; another from the Society of Radical Reformers meeting at the Rotunda; another from reformers at Stockport, and a fourth from reformers at Ipswich. They prayed for a great extension of the elective franchise, and for vote by ballot. One of the petitions expressed their joy that the Tories had gone out of office, but their dissatisfaction that the Whigs had come in, for they suspected that, when in office, they might forget the promises made when out of it. The measures of the Whigs, the petitioners stated, had been most injurious to the country—they had begun the national debt, they were the authors of the Excise, and of Septennial Parliaments, as well as of many other abuses. The petitioners, therefore, prayed the House to watch the Whig Administration narrowly. He hoped and believed, that the petitioners would find themselves mistaken with respect to the present Ministers. They had on that evening given an earnest of their disposition to economy, and were the only Administration which had ever come in on a pledge to maintain peace abroad, and to effect reduction and reform at home.

The Petitions to be printed.

Postmaster-general of Ireland.] On Mr. Spring Rice's Motion, that the Speaker leave the Chair for the House to go into a Committee of Supply,

Mr. *Goulburn* said, that he wished to say a few words relative to what had fallen from the hon. Gentleman on a former night, concerning the Post-master-general of Ireland, and at which time he did not happen to be in the House. He did not wish to derogate any thing from the present, or to arrogate anything to the past Administration. All he wished was, that the case should stand on its true footing with the House; and he begged to inform it that this saving would have been equally effected if the present Ministers had never come into Office. It had been said, that the office ought to have been abolished; but this was impossible till a new measure had been introduced into Parliament for the purpose of putting the business of the office on another footing. The office, however, was virtually abolished. This assertion did not rest upon his dictum, but was known in the office to which the hon. Gentleman now belonged; and if he had remained in Office, it was his intention to bring forward a measure for the consolidation of the Post-offices, and to get rid of the place in question. The present Government, therefore, had done no more than the former Government intended to do. There was a legal difficulty in the way of abolishing the office and he repeated, that the moment that difficulty should have been removed by Parliament, it was the intention of the late Government to have abolished the office. If the present Government should accept the resignation of the Postmaster-general of Ireland before they made any alteration of the law with reference to that office, they would leave that department of the public service without a responsible head. Without the authority of the Postmaster-general, the Government could not legally transmit letters, or demand money for their transmission.

Mr. *Rice* disclaimed all idea of taking advantage of his right hon. friend's absence, for the purpose of mentioning any statement. What he had said had referred to Lord Ross, and not to Lord O'Neil, and the resignation of the former was made to the present First Lord of the Treasury; so that, of course, his right hon. friend could not know of that. If he had been aware that it was the intention of the former Government to abolish the office, he should not have withheld that information from the House.

Sir *H. Hardinge* said, that Lord Ross had only held the office till the legal difficulties could be removed; and when that took place it was determined to abolish the office.

Salaries, Pensions, National

Distress.] Mr. Alderman *Waithman* wished to say, that as he found the subject of Salaries and Pensions had been taken up by the Minister in whose hands it could be most successfully prosecuted, it was his intention to forego bringing that subject before the House, according to a notice he had given on a preceding evening. He would at the same time give notice of his intention, after Christmas, to lay certain facts before the House relative to the state of the country; and he trusted that the House would adopt them, as they were facts—not opinions. It was also his intention to move the repeal of the house and window taxes, though he trusted that the Government would take this matter on itself.

Mr. *George Dawson* then adverted to the impression which had been made on the public mind by the reports which had been published of the salaries and pensions enjoyed by public men, and the reports which had been circulated of the intention of the present Ministers to reduce them, which, if allowed to be circulated without some explanation, might have some bad effect. He knew what was the wish of the House, and he knew in what manner the present Government was pledged to encourage economy; at the same time he thought the House ought not to forget what had been effected by former Administrations. It was only justice to former Governments to remind the House of what they had done, and he determined when he heard the hon. Members opposite taking such credit to themselves for reducing the situations of Vice-treasurer and Postmaster-general of Ireland, to make a statement of the reductions which had been made by the former Administration. It was his intention to have made such a statement on the present occasion, but finding the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not in his place, he should postpone it, and take the earliest opportunity, when it was convenient, to make it. Such a statement ought to be made. It was equally due to the dignity and character of the late Administration and the House of Commons.

Sir *George Warrender* wished to take that opportunity of stating that, he hoped the present Ministers would continue to enforce that rigid economy with which they had begun. If they should zealously pursue the course they had marked out for themselves, they would be entitled to, and he had no doubt that they would obtain, the cordial concurrence of that House, and the support of the country. Their course of proceeding hitherto had been such as entitled them to his fullest confidence. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer were in his place, he would ask him if he did not consider it desirable to refer the papers, giving an account of pensions and salaries, to a committee, in order that its errors might be corrected and explained? He remembered being on a committee formerly—the committee moved for by the hon. member for Dorsetshire; and in that committee, which sat for two years, several errors in the documents laid before it were corrected. It was desirable, in his opinion, that such a committee should now be appointed, in order that the truth should be known. It was most desirable that misrepresentation should be checked, and error put down. The truth was itself painful enough, but if it were separated from error, and only the truth were told, that would allay much of the irritation which now prevailed in the public mind. He ventured to recommend some measure like a committee, with no view of hostility to the present Government, which he regarded from its proceedings as eminently entitled to confidence, but as tending to promote a public benefit. He was scarcely able to express the satisfaction with which he had heard that the present Ministers had not filled up several situations in England, Scotland, and Ireland, which had fallen vacant since their accession to Office. If they pursued the same prudent wise career, they would fix themselves firmly in public opinion.

Mr. *George Dawson* was willing to give the present Government credit for their reductions, but they must carry them much further than at present to surpass the reductions of the last Government.

Mr. *Baring* was understood to say, that the paper describing the salaries and pensions of public officers had created a great sensation in the public, and was calculated, if uncontradicted, and if unexplained, to shake the general confidence in all public men, and even in the Legislature. He wished that the paper should be examined, by a Committee, and if so examined he was sure that none of the objectionable items would be found to belong to the last ten or fifteen years. He wished that that paper should be brought fairly before the public, and if it were brought fairly forward, he was sure it would be seen that none of the corruption of which it was supposed to be evidence had taken place of late years. He should say, that very little of such corruption had existed since he had been in the House, and he recollected little or none of such corrupt influence being employed as might be presumed from that return. He repeated, that the paper in question was calculated to produce a most painful effect, and to shake the confidence of the public in all public men, and in the Legislature itself. It would be proper, therefore, that a Committee should analyse that paper, and separate the truth from the falsehood, and show what part of it was derived from late and what from former Administrations. He wished to say one word on another subject—the subject of an inquiry into the general distress of the country. A worthy Alderman had previously alluded to this subject; but he must express his doubts as to the utility of that general inquiry which he suggested. An inquiry into all the causes of the national distress could not produce any good, and he should be sorry to see the House go into an inquiry which could not end in conferring credit on itself or benefit to the public. A parliamentary inquiry into the condition of the southern parts of the kingdom, into the districts which were now visited by disturbance, would be very important, and might be very useful. Commissions had been issued to support the authority of the laws, which had been violated in those districts, and which must be supported for the benefit even of the poor themselves, for it was essential to their happiness that property should be protected, and that all men should have confidence in the protection of the law; but those Commissions, it was known, were likely to punish a class of persons who had been driven into outrage, partly by distress, and partly by the terror of others. He knew that the papers moved for by the right hon. Baronet would show the sums of money raised and expended for the poor; but he wished for an inquiry into their condition, which would show the general nature of the payments they received, the extent of their remuneration, and the defective system under which the Poor-laws were at present administered. It was a great misfortune, that in many places the labourers were paid wages out of the poor-rates, and he should like, therefore, to have an inquiry into the mode of administering the Poor-laws. The evils of the poor-rates were very great, but whether any remedy could be found for these grievances was a grave consideration. After all the schemes which had been brought forward on this subject, he must say—after applying his mind to the subject too—that he had no hopes that any legislative remedy could be found for such extensive grievances. At the same time he should think that the House abandoned its duty if it did not examine the subject, and ascertain what was the state of the administration of the Poor-laws, and if any remedy could be found for the evils which existed. To that extent he hoped that the House would institute an inquiry, and, so limited, it would produce a very good effect; but he could not think that an inquiry into the general causes of distress would be useful. He would repeat, as he had before stated, that generally the great interests of the country were not in an unfavourable position, and that what the country wanted was quiet, order, peace and confidence. To ascertain the state of the agricultural districts was most important, for the other interests, he must repeat, were moving well.

Colonel *Sibthorp* was of opinion, that the country was in an alarming crisis, and if any proof were wanting of the correctness of the reports that were circulated in the newspapers, it might be found in the circumstance that a great number of Members of that House had received leave of absence on account of the disturbed state of those parts of the country with which they were connected. He wished to say nothing of the defunct, though not absent Ministry; but he believed, that all the economy and reductions for which they took credit had been forced on them by that House echoing the demands of the people.

Mr. *George Robinson* remembered, that the hon. member for Callington had been one of those who last Session resisted an inquiry into the state of the country, which was then proposed. There was no subject of more importance, which called more earnestly for the deliberations of the House, than the condition of the labouring classes, with a view to remedy their distress. He and others thought such an inquiry necessary last year; but the hon.

Member had then deprecated it, as leading to no satisfactory conclusion. He would request hon. Members to turn their serious attention to the situation of every class in the country, and not confine themselves to the state of the southern counties, but inquire into the state of all the industrious classes. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer were not absent, he would venture to throw out a suggestion which he thought worth attending to. It would be recollected, that last Session the hon. member for Dover had proposed a general inquiry into the state of taxation, with a view of better adapting it to the present state of our circumstances. The motion was negatived, though supported by many members of the present Administration, and he hoped they would now take an early opportunity of proposing such an inquiry, with a view to a revision of taxation. It was most important first to inquire into the distress, but after that was accomplished, and all possible relief afforded by the reduction of taxation, he hoped that an inquiry would be set on foot as to the propriety of improving the mode of levying taxation. After every retrenchment had been made, it should be ascertained what were the best means of levying the taxes necessary for the payment of the National Debt and the public service, so that they should be equally levied on all classes. At present, industry was most unequally oppressed by taxation, and it ought to be relieved. Hints were given several times last Session of the propriety of imposing a Property-tax, though they had not been favourably received. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer, he remembered, stated, that the measure of a Property tax had been under the consideration of his Majesty's Government; and he recollected that the right hon. Gentleman, the member for Liverpool, now unhappily no more, said, that he considered the imposition of such a tax would be necessary. The noble Lord who was at present Chancellor of the Exchequer was, he believed, not unfavourable to a tax on property, and under such circumstances, he hoped, after the Government had retrenched, that it would consider the propriety of revising our whole system of taxation—after it had done all it could to lighten the burdens of the country, that it would consider of measures to levy the necessary taxes more equally, and with greater facility. He did not say that funded property ought to be taxed, but at present that went quite free, while taxes were levied on the necessaries of life, which operated most injuriously on the poorer classes. That was a subject which he should, perhaps, enforce more at length when the Chancellor of the Exchequer was in the House, and he would then only observe, that he hoped that the inquiry, if one were instituted, would not be confined to the southern counties, or to one part of the administration of the Poor-laws, but extended to all the causes of national distress.

Sir *Robert Peel* thought the hon. Gentleman had shown, by his own observations, that such an inquiry as he had recommended would be vague and unsatisfactory. He had mentioned one topic on which he desired a special inquiry, namely, the operation of taxation in producing the general distress. For that he wanted a Special Committee. If a committee were appointed to inquire into the causes of the general distress, that cause would undergo investigation; and was he to be told that it would be possible for one committee to inquire into all the causes of distress? That one committee would have to inquire into the effect of the Corn-laws—of the Poor-laws—into the effect of taxation; and, after having inquired into the effects of all these things, it would have to find out remedies for the distress. If, however, a committee could be appointed to inquire into the subjects mentioned by the hon. member for Callington, he thought it would be beneficial. The time was come when it would be most expedient for the House to institute some inquiry into the state of the agricultural districts, and into the causes of the disturbances in the southern counties; and particularly into the practical operation and administration of the Poor-laws. An inquiry, limited to the defects of the administration of those laws, might be most useful, and he would willingly go into it, without any reference to party or politics, but solely with a view to better the condition of the labouring classes. It was of great importance to get a few facts, so that the present condition of the labourer in some counties—in the weald of Kent and Sussex, for example—might be contrasted with his condition in other counties, under different physical circumstances, and with his condition in past times. He should like, also, to contrast the condition of the agricultural labourers in those districts where wages were paid out of the rates, and where roundsmen were common, with their condition in those districts where the wages of the labourers were wholly paid by the employer, and roundsmen were unknown. The practical operation of the two systems would then be accurately known, which would be of great use. He would inquire also into the influence of rents, and into their amount. At present, it was generally stated that high rents had contributed to the distress. That was not his opinion; but in the Committee those who supported that opinion could be heard, and the land-owners might have an opportunity of proving its incorrectness. The Committee might inquire, too, into the probability of our population finding a vent in our colonies of North America. A gentleman, who had been sent thither to make inquiries into the quantity of land yet unappropriated, and into the best conditions of making grants, had lately returned, and he had made his report to the Secretary of State for the Colonies; and a Committee, having his information, might examine how far voluntary emigration might be looked to as a means of relief. If he only had complete information as to the present state of the agricultural labourers in two or three counties, and their condition in the same counties forty years ago, and some knowledge of their condition in other counties, he would not say that some remedy for the distress might not be devised; for he still remained of opinion, that a correct arrangement of a few prominent and leading facts was the best foundation for future measures. If he were placed in the Committee, he should make it his object to devote his time to the inquiry; and the public time of public men could not be better employed than in investigating such a subject.

Sir *E. Knatchbull* for one, courted a full inquiry into all the particulars of the county he represented. Justice would not be done to the landowners and the farmers unless such an inquiry were instituted. Charges had been made against them which ought to be refuted, and which he was sure a Committee would refute. The actual state of the tenantry and of their landlords ought to be ascertained. It was said—most unjustly he believed—that rents were too high, and must be reduced; that was a subject that ought to be investigated, and, if they were too high, they ought to be reduced. The situation of the labourers, too, demanded investigation. Many of them, when employed, obtained adequate wages; but there were too many of them; and many of them got no employment, so that their condition was most unequal. At the same time the farmers who paid these men proper wages, and those who did not, had both to contribute equally to the poor-rates, so that as long as the present system continued there were strong motives for the farmer in no case to pay adequate wages. He was convinced that an inquiry would do a great deal of good, he implored inquiry, and he hoped that it would relieve the sufferings of the labouring classes, and restore them to that place in society which they ought to occupy.

Sir *Robert Peel* hoped it would be understood that he attributed the present condition of the agricultural classes to no particular persons, nor did he speak of it as caused by the fault of any body of men. He was afraid that the condition of the agricultural labourers had been gradually deteriorating for several years past but he did not attribute that as a fault to any one class. He wished it also to be understood, that he had never once thought or said, that the deterioration in the condition of the agricultural labourers was caused by the conduct of the upper classes.

Mr. *Ormsby Gore* complained of the unjust interference of the parish officers with the labourers' wages, and condemned the payment of wages out of the poor-rates. The hon. Member referred to the conduct of Lord Gage, but was set right by being informed that the noble Lord had explained that matter in the newspapers. He had heard that many people had only 1*s*. a week, and were compelled to live on that. That was a sad blot on this country. It was cruel, unjust, and impolitic. He believed that what an hon. friend had stated on a former day, that the negroes were better fed and clothed than English labourers, was quite correct. It was necessary to state this, for there was, he believed, a bill to be read to-morrow, to make a compulsory rate for the relief of the poor. The House could not be too cautious, for the newspapers found their way into every cottage of the country as well as into the drawing room. In the county with which he was connected (Salop), there had been no disturbances, and there no interference took place with the labourer, and wages were never paid out of the poor-rates. Generally the people received 9*s*., 10*s*., or 11*s*. a-week, and he had not heard of any complaint. An endeavour was there made to keep up the spirit of independence by fixing a stigma on those who, being able to work, consented to receive or made any application for parish relief.

Mr. *Long Wellesley* explained and defended the conduct of Lord Gage, as it had been already explained and defended by his Lordship in the public prints. He wished to suggest that, should a committee be appointed, it would be proper to inquire into the sums of money expended out of the poor-rates for litigation.

Mr. *Owen O'Conner* wished the inquiry, should one be gone into, to be extended to Ireland. The distress of the people there was very great. When he saw the comfort of the English people, he was astonished at their complaints and disturbances. The Irish had nothing but a few potatoes and salt to live on, and wretched cabins to dwell in.

Mr. *O'Brien* also wished that a committee should be appointed, and that its researches should be extended to Ireland. The arm of justice was about to fall on the extremely poor, and he thought that care should be taken to heal the wounds which might be inflicted. The committee ought to be appointed immediately.

Mr. *Curteis* said, Lord Gage was a most upright and honourable man, and he was satisfied that no blame whatever could be justly imputed to that nobleman. He denied that it was the practice to pay wages out of poor-rates in Sussex, but he wished to ask, how it was possible that a man who was earning 12*s*. a week could maintain eight or ten children? The distress was not caused by low wages, but want of employment. He had paid 1*s*. 9*d*. per day for wages through all last winter as an amateur farmer, and he knew that where the farmers could afford it they paid 2*s*. per day; but they could not find employment for all the labourers. He wished that an inquiry should be instituted into the condition of all classes; and he was sure, if something were not done, and speedily done, society would fall into a most lamentable state of disorganization.

Sir *John Bourke* complained of Connaught being much neglected by Parliament. Ulster, Munster, and Dublin, had received large grants of public money; but Connaught had never received any. There was great distress at present on the sea coast of that part of the country, and the potatoes had been a very short crop. He suggested the propriety of reforming the Grand Jury system, and of granting some part of the public money to promote inland navigation. Advances to promote the industry of the Irish at home would be the most effectual means of improving their condition, and of keeping them in their own country.

Mr. *A. Trevor* said, he agreed with the member for Sussex (Mr. Curteis), that an inquiry should be made into the state of the agricultural interests; and that means should be taken to afford the labourer a fair rate of wages without injuring the farming or landed interests. He could not agree with the member for Callington in his view of the state of the country, which he considered to be in a state of lawless insubordination, and till that was put down, he could have little hope of any good arising by any other means proposed.

Mr. *P. Howard* implored the House, as it was about to vote away the produce of the taxes, to direct its attention to economy, and by all means to endeavour to manage the income and expenditure in such a manner as to allow of the repeal of the Malt-tax, which now pressed so severely on the agricultural classes.

SUPPLY—ARMY.] The House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. *Spring Rice*, before he called on the Committee to consent to the Resolutions which he had to propose, felt it his duty to say, that the Estimates, which he now wished to provide for, were those framed by the late Government. His Majesty's present Ministers had rather directed their attention to those Estimates which were to be prepared than to those which had been already made up; and as the sums now required were merely directed to supply the expenditure of the two months of the quarter, and to provide for expenses already incurred, he did not anticipate any objection to them from the hon. Gentlemen opposite. Having said thus much, he should at once move that a sum not exceeding 137,500*l*. be granted to make good the extraordinary expenses of the Army up to the end of the year 1830.

Resolution agreed to.

On the Resolution granting a sum of 113,000*l.* to defray the Army services for seven days, from the 25th to the 31st of December, 1830,

Mr. *Cresset Pelham* condemned the extravagance of the Estimates for the Army, and observed, that at the commencement of the American war the whole annual amount required for the Army was only 613,000*l.*, a sum scarcely sufficient to pay the expenses of the present force for a single month.

Resolutions—granting 93,872*l.* to complete the sums required for the expenses of the Commissariat; 40,000*l.* for the Civil Contingencies; and 50,000*l.* to defray the expenses of works completed under the direction of the Board of Ordnance were agreed to.

SUPPLY—WINDSOR CASTLE.] On the Resolution requiring a further sum of 25,000*l.* to defray the expenses of repairs and improvements of Windsor Castle,

Colonel *Sibthorp* protested against the expenditure of money in such a lavish manner, without the prospect of coming to any termination. They had already expended a sum of above 900,000*l.* to complete alterations, which had been originally stated in the Estimate laid before the House at only 150,000*l.* In the present state of the country he thought it would be highly culpable in the Members of that House to sanction the continuance of this extravagance.

Mr. *Spring Rice* begged to remind the hon. Member, that the sum now required was for the purpose of defraying expenses already incurred. It should also be recollected, that when this subject was mentioned in connexion with the Estimates of the year on a former occasion, the House refused to sanction the expenditure of any further sums until a committee was appointed to inquire into the nature of the Estimates and the state of the works. That committee was accordingly appointed, and its Report was now on the Table of the House. He could assure the hon. Member, and the House, that the suggestions contained in it would be maturely weighed before the Government attempted to come before them for any further sums on the same account. No such Estimate was yet formed or determined on; but he was certain, that when it was presented it would be found to be regulated on the strictest principles of economy.

Sir *G. Warrender* expressed a hope that Windsor Castle, the ancient Palace of our Sovereigns, would, now that the country had gone so far, be thoroughly repaired, and rendered fit for the residence of the Monarch. He felt that the situation of the country required the most rigid economy; but he was confident that real economy would be more effectually consulted by the completion of the edifice than by leaving it in its present state. He was quite confident that it was the wish of the great majority of the people of this country, that this ancient and splendid edifice should be placed in a proper condition; and he thought, that as they had engaged in the work, and already spent a very considerable sum, they were in some degree bound to complete it.

Mr. *George Robinson* said, the expenses already incurred were more than four times in excess over the original estimate; and it should be recollected, that the work was commenced on the assurance of the Government, that the expense was to be kept within the Estimate. He protested against the doctrine of the hon. Baronet, that they were bound to go on with this extravagant expenditure because they had already assented to it in so many instances before. Such language was always held to that House when the Government wished to procure money to gratify a taste for architectural extravagance. At the time when they were called on to make a large grant for the triumphal arch opposite Buckingham Palace the very same language was used; and it was argued that as a very large sum had already been expended (without any estimate be it recollected), they were bound to grant the money required, lest the first sum should be lost. In his opinion, it would be much better that the first expense should be lost than that they should, in the present state of the country, persist in such foolish extravagance. He hoped that, at all events, the present Government would adopt a different course, and that they would produce a full and satisfactory estimate of every work before they called on that House to advance money for the purpose of carrying it on.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* agreed with the hon. Member respecting the propriety of having estimates of every work laid before the House when it was called on to vote the public money to pay for them. In his opinion the whole course they had hitherto pursued was contrary to law, for it was distinctly declared by Mr. Burke's Bill, that no sums were to be expended on public works by estimate, but always by contract, if the amount was above the sum of 5,000*l.* He trusted, however, that the times in which the House found itself placed in the dilemma of either going on with useless and extravagant works, or of abandoning what it had already expended as lost, were now passing away, and that the present Government would feel the necessity of pursuing a course more consonant with those principles on which it sought the approbation and support of the country. By these principles the present Government were now to be tried, and he trusted the House would find them sensible of the distresses of the country, and that economy would at last be construed in its true meaning—that of unsparing retrenchment.

Mr. *Curteis* professed his determination to divide the House as often as its forms would permit, if any attempt was made in the present state of the country, to obtain money for carrying on the erection of two palaces at the same time.

Mr. *Warburton* said, he understood, from good authority, that the architect employed in the erection of Buckingham Palace had sent in an account for one quarter, greater by some thousands than the sum originally required for the whole of the improvements. He understood that an immense sum was yet required to complete that palace; but he hoped that the present Ministers, before they made any demand for that purpose, would take care to ascertain by estimate what was the probable amount required for this purpose. It was but justice to the late Ministers to say that they had, on learning the return of the expenditure going on, ordered the works to be suspended, but he thought it would have been more to their credit if they had given that order during the life of the late King, rather than after the accession of the present Sovereign. He trusted, however, that the time was passed when they would be required to vote money for estimates prepared in secret. The precedents of that kind were productive of bad effects, and should be carefully avoided.

Mr. *Spring Rice* assured the House that the strictest economy would be adopted in every branch of the public service, and that any attempt to obtain money on unauthorised or unrecognised statements would be carefully avoided.

Resolution agreed to.

SUPPLY—RIDEAU CANAL.] Mr. *S. Rice*, in calling on the Committee to assent to a Resolution, granting 40,750*l.*, to complete the sum required by the estimate of the year 1830, for the Rideau Canal, called its attention to the expense which had already been incurred. Several estimates had been framed in the progress of the work, and a sum of 300,000*l.* had been added to the original estimate in consequence of difficulties occurring from the nature of the ground. A Committee of Engineers who last examined the works had reported that they might be completed for 160,000*l.* in addition to the 572,000*l.* already expended. This sum it was proposed to spread over the four years up to 1831; but it was now found that 440,000*l.* would be necessary; and as the Government were not prepared to make a demand to that extent, or to any extent without the most diligent inquiry into its propriety, they required merely the sum which would become due for the present year, according to the original agreement.

Mr. *Warburton* gave the Government credit for its candour, but protested against any further expenditure, as the regulations with respect to trade would render the canal totally useless for the purposes which were originally contemplated. No commodities, such as the canal was intended to convey, would now be required from Canada.

Mr. *Maberly* also protested against any further expenditure of British capital on the canal, and ridiculed the idea of fortifying 1,700 miles of frontier at the expense of 5,000,000*l.* to be paid by this country.

Mr. *Labouchere* had, from a conviction of its necessity, always voted for this expenditure on the canal and fortifications, and he was still prepared to contend that they should be completed. It was the duty of the Government to provide for the adequate defence of its possessions; and by no other means than those now in progress could they procure a thoroughly defensible line of frontier, although he was not prepared to say that the Government might not have been much deceived with respect to the amount of expenditure required for that purpose. The most efficient barrier against an invader was, however, a contented and satisfied population; and he hoped that some attention would now be paid to the Civil Administration of Canada, as he was confident all matters in dispute could be adjusted with very little difficulty.

Mr. *Goulburn* defended the conduct of the late Government with respect to Canada and the Rideau Canal; and contended that it had never agreed to advance a single shilling without calling on a Board of Engineers to examine the works, and make a report of their condition, and the probable expense of completing them. The original sum stated to be required for the canal was only 150,000*l.*; but when the forest was cleared, and the ground opened, it was found that 300,000*l.* more would be necessary; and a Board of Engineers were twice called on to examine the works before it was agreed that this sum should be expended.

Mr. *Maberly* repeated his protest against the expenditure of so much British capital upon the fortification of the frontier line of Canada.

Sir *H. Hardinge* was sure that it would be found, on inquiry, that the Rideau Canal expense had been much exaggerated as compared with its advantages. It should be borne in mind, that the mere transport expense of the British army in the last war with America up the St. Lawrence was very nearly 1,000,000*l.* per annum, the charge being 630,000*l.* for the transport of ammunition and provisions alone, and that that charge more than exceeded the cost of the Rideau Canal, by means of which these transports could be made with great facility and little charge in future. Then, when it was recollected that our maritime, and thence our commercial superiority over America, depended in a great degree on our maintaining a good line of frontier, of which the Rideau Canal was the main chain, he was sure hon. Members would not be too eager to cavil at the expense we had already gone to, and might feel necessary to continue till the original design was complete. He was confident that the day on which we gave up that frontier, with all our works on it, to America, would be the date of her maritime superiority, and, as a consequence, of our maritime decline.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* concurred in opinion upon the subject with his hon. friend the member for Bridport.

Resolution agreed to; as also a Resolution for granting the sum of 71,758*l.* 9*s.* 7*d.* to complete the sum voted in the last Session for Miscellaneous Services in Ireland.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.] Sir *E. Knatchbull* was desirous of asking the noble Lord a question with respect to the Adjournment for the holidays. He did not wish to embarrass the noble Lord, but it was of great importance to hon. Members, with reference both to private bills and to election petitions, to know when it was intended to move the Adjournment, and for what length of time.

Lord *Palmerston* answered, that the day of Adjournment must depend upon the progress of public business. As far as he was able to judge, he thought that the Adjournment might probably take place about the 16th inst. It was impossible for him, however, to state the precise day. What the probable length of the Adjournment might be he could not exactly say. He was sure that it must be generally felt, that in the existing state of the country the presence of hon. Gentlemen for a time in their respective counties was exceedingly desirable; and that they would be almost more useful there than in their places in that House. It was also expedient that the Members of his Majesty's Government should have the means of looking round them, and arranging the various measures which it would be their duty to propose to Parliament. It was probable, therefore, that the Adjournment would be for as long a period as was consistent with the practice of the House.

The House resumed.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, Dec. 7.

MINUTES.] Petitions Presented. For the abolition of Slavery, by Lords CALTHORPE, DACRE, and BEXLEY, the Marquis of CLANRICARD, the Bishop of LONDON, and the Archbishop of CANTERBURY, from Holyhead, from several places in Staffordshire, from the Baptist Meeting-house in Hereford, from the Inhabitants of Birmingham, from the Inhabitants of Camberwell, from the Congregation of York Chapel, Walworth, from Reigate, from Brixton, and from various other places. By the Marquis of CLANRICARDE, from the Chamber of Commerce in Dublin, for an Assimilation of the Bankrupt Laws; from Killarney, for a Repeal of the Subletting Act; and from the Catholic Inhabitants of the Parish of St. Michan and St. John, Dublin, for a better appropriation of the Parliamentary Grants voted for Education in Ireland.

The Consolidated Fund Bill was brought up from the Commons, and read a first time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, Dec. 7.

MINUTES.] Lord ALTHORP, for Northamptonshire; the right hon. R. GRANT, for Norwich; the right hon. P. THOMSON, for Dover; F. T. BARING, esq., for Portsmouth; and WM. EWART, esq., took the Oaths and their Seats.

The Regency Bill was brought down from the Lords, and read a first time. The Consolidated Fund Bill was read a third time and passed.

Bills for Amending the Laws relating to Turnpike-roads (Scotland), and to appoint Land-tax Commissioners were brought in.

Petitions presented. For the immediate abolition of Slavery, by Mr. BAYNTUN, from York:—By Sir H. PARNELL, from Maryborough, in the Queen's County:—By Mr. EVANS, from Melton Mowbray:—By Mr. TYRELL, from Braybrooke, and several places in Essex:—By Mr. J. JOHNSTONE, from Dumfermline:—By Lord HOWICK, from Arbroath:—By Mr. WATSON, from Canterbury:—By Mr. ORMSBY GORE, from a place in Caernarvon:—By Mr. WM. DUNCOMBE, several from Halifax and other places in Yorkshire:—By Mr. ADEANE, from Elm, in the Isle of Ely:—By Sir H. H. BUNBURY, from five places in Suffolk:—By Colonel WARD, two Petitions from Breconshire, against the continuance of Slavery. For Reform, by Mr. J. WOOD, from Oldham:—By Mr. S. LUMLEY, from Sutton cum Ashfield:—By Mr. J. JOHNSTONE, from the Corporation of Hammermen in Edinburgh. By Sir H. PARNELL, from the Queen's County, praying an amelioration of the system of Public Education in Ireland.

SALARIES AND EMOLUMENTS.] Lord *Althorp*, the new Chancellor of the Exchequer, amidst the most profound silence throughout the House, which had previously been rather disturbed, rose and spoke as follows: —"Mr. Speaker I have now to announce to the House, that it is my intention upon Thursday next to move that a Select Committee be appointed, to inquire into what reductions can and ought to be made in the Salaries and Emoluments of all officers in his Majesty's service, holding places at the pleasure of the Crown, and being Members of Parliament." The noble Lord sat down amidst vehement and reiterated cheers, which for a long time resounded through the House.

CIVIL LIST.] Lord *Althorp*, as soon as the cheering had subsided, again rose and gave notice, that on Friday next he should propose in the Committee of Supply, a vote, on account for the Civil List.

Sir *H. Parnell* inquired what course his Majesty's Ministers meant to pursue with respect to the Civil List—was it to be brought immediately before the House, or was it to be postponed till after the new Ministers had been able to prepare new estimates.

Lord *Althorp* said, that he presumed that the House was very well aware that Ministers disapproved of the mode in which the Civil List had been made up by their predecessors in office. Nevertheless, they did not as yet feel themselves justified, upon their own responsibility, to take into consideration what alterations ought to be made in the Civil List, and he trusted that the House would be good enough to give them time to take the subject in hand, and to produce the plan which they might wish ultimately to prevail. What he now proposed to do was, to ask of the House to grant a sum on account, until he was prepared with a permanent measure. The House was well aware, and gentlemen who had recently been in office must be peculiarly aware, that it was absolutely necessary for him to have a certain degree of time, in order to be prepared to enter into the question of the Civil List, in a manner satisfactory to that House, and satisfactory to the public. Very early after the recess, he would bring forward his proposition, and would endeavour to meet the wishes of the public, while he provided for the dignity of the Crown.

LORD CHANCELLOR OF IRELAND.] Mr. *G. Dawson* said, that as far as he was personally concerned he should waive any opposition to the plan proposed. He wished to put one question to his Majesty's Ministers, founded upon a report that had got abroad. Was Sir Anthony Hart about to retire from the Chancellorship of Ireland? and if he was, he wished to know whether he did or did not retire with his own consent? He knew that a little gentle violence had been necessary, but at length it had been successful, before a noble Lord, lately an hon. Member of that House could be persuaded to take the Great Seal of England, and he believed a very little of the same kind of force would be sufficient to make Sir A. Hart remain in office, and save the country a considerable sum. A pension of 4,000*l.* a-year would be imposed upon the country by any arrangement of this sort, and this was scarcely consistent with the economy which the Ministers had recently practised in the reduction of two offices in Ireland.

Lord *Althorp* replied, that he was not

at present able to answer the question, for, like the hon. Member himself, he had only learned the subject that day, and upon report.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL LIST.] Sir *R. Peel* addressed himself to Lord Althorp across the Table, and was understood to say, that as the Order of the House had already been made for the appointment of a Committee upon the Civil List, his Majesty's Ministers ought to move to rescind that order, and then to appoint another committee, as it would be very irregular and improper to keep the present committee in abeyance merely upon a private understanding that the noble Lord was preparing papers, and getting ready propositions to lay before it. He apprehended that another committee could not be appointed, nor could the subject, with propriety, be taken out of the hands of the present Committee, unless the House first rescinded the order for its appointment.

Mr. *J. Wood* said, that he had heard the proposition of the noble Lord with very great pleasure, and he felt convinced that the proposition of the noble Lord would be well received by that House, and, what was of greater importance, by the country at large. That Ministers should take a vote of credit in order to give themselves time to re-model the Civil List, and to ascertain how far they could meet the wishes of the country for retrenchment, was a proposition reasonable in itself, and nothing could be better calculated to ensure the approbation of the people out of doors, and to ensure likewise, not the approbation of "the party" within Parliament, but of the no-party to which he belonged,—the no-party, which never meant to combine in any opposition to Ministers, with a view of getting round again to those places out of which they had just been turned by the voice of the country. Considering the quarter from which the objection came,—from a person who had so lately been the leader of that House, and in occupation of a place on the Ministerial Benches,—he thought, of all men on earth, the hon. Baronet ought to be the last to throw unnecessary impediments in the way of the noble Lord. Such seemed to him to be the conduct of the hon. Baronet, who appeared to him to have said, "I will give Ministers no time whatever to prepare a Civil List,—a Committee is formed, and to that Committee ought immediately to be referred the Civil List got up by the preceding Treasury Bench." For his own part, he was happy to say that he thought Ministers were now pursuing a course which would entitle them to the confidence of the country, and he was convinced that the people of England would cordially approve of their taking time to consider the reductions in the Civil List, in order to lay them before that Committee, which the hon. Baronet should recollect had been appointed in direct opposition to the wishes and efforts of himself and of those who so recently acted with him.

Sir *R. Peel*:—Mr. Speaker, I never heard such a speech as that in my life. Is it for the hon. Gentleman, because I chose to put a question to his Majesty's Ministers on the course they means to pursue, to lecture me?—Does the hon. Gentleman consider himself entitled to lecture me, I say, upon throwing impediments in the way of his Majesty's Government? Impediments!—what impediments have I thrown in the way of the noble Lord? The noble Lord may, perhaps be perfectly reasonable, perfectly right in his wish that Government should have time to consider what Civil List they will propose to the Committee, and that the Committee shall not meet until the proposition is ready to be made. But what I say is, that an order of the House is already made that a Select Committee be appointed, and yet the noble Lord says he shall not be prepared to make any proposal to that Committee until after the Christmas recess, and therefore two months must elapse before the Committee can sit with effect. If this be so, surely there ought to be some distinct proceeding on the part of the House to sanction the non-meeting of the Committee. The hon. Gentleman says, because I was against the appointment of that Committee, I ought to be ready to acquiesce in the proposal of the noble Lord. Sir, we are to consider the orders of the House, and not the sentiments of individuals. If the noble Lord thinks that the Committee ought not to meet till after the Christmas recess, this postponement should have the direct sanction of the House.

Lord *Althorp* said, that he could recollect even in the last Session of Parliament that a Committee had been appointed upon the motion of the right hon. Baronet himself, to inquire into the Superannuation List, and which committee did not sit until six weeks after. He did not think his proposition either new or extraordinary, for every Member of that House who had been accustomed to sit on committees was well aware that their sitting depended very much upon the convenience of the Members composing them, and likewise on the convenience of the public business. If he had moved to rescind the Order of the House, he should only have to move the re-appointment of the committee when the propositions were ready to be brought forward. He had left the arrangement upon the usual understanding that the committee should not meet until it was convenient.

Mr. *Croker* said it would be better to appoint a new committee.

Mr. *Courtenay* thought it best to withdraw the papers before the committee, and to substitute others.

VOTES OF BURGESSES.] Mr. Hodgson moved for a return to be made by the Town Clerk of every city and borough in England and Ireland returning Members to Parliament, wherein the right of election is solely or in part in the free burgesses or freemen at large, of the number of persons entitled to the freedom of such city or borough, who have taken up their freedom within the last four years.

Mr. *Bankes* opposed the Motion, on the ground that the expense and inconvenience which would be incurred by such a return was infinitely disproportioned to any advantage that could be derived from it.

Mr. *Hodgson* explained, that the expense of obtaining the returns which he desired would not exceed the cost of 100 letters and 100 replies; that being the number of the town clerks from whom the information was to be obtained.

Mr. *Croker* said, that the Motion was attended with a difficulty which could not be got over. No one in that House, much less the town clerks of the several boroughs, could undertake to say who had and who had not a right to vote at elections for Members of Parliament. The House would not delegate to the persons mentioned in the hon. Gentleman's motion, the exercise of its exclusive right.

Mr. *Hodgson* consented to withdraw the Motion until Tuesday next, in order to insert the word "reputed" before the words "Right of Election."

RECENT PENSIONS.] Mr. *Tennyson* inquired of the hon member for Armagh, whether there was any truth in the report that the late Administration had procured the addition of several names to the Pension List, after the head of that Ministry had virtually resigned?

Mr. *Goulburn* said, that he believed one pension had been granted on the morning of the day on which the late Ministry resigned. He had not heard of more than one such grant.

SCOTCH LAW OF ENTAIL.] Mr. *Kennedy* moved for leave to bring in three Bills relative to the Law of Entail in Scotland. The House he said, would probably recollect, that the subject was not new, as committees were appointed to inquire into it in 1828 and 1829, and bills were introduced into the House under the sanction and approbation of these committees. In 1829, two bills would undoubtedly have passed, had it not been for the peculiar pressure of business, for with a few exceptions, a very favourable opinion of them was entertained. The two first bills he proposed to bring in on the present occasion, were the same as those of 1829. The third was contained in the bill of 1828, but was not brought forward in 1829. It was universally admitted, that the law of Scotland upon the subject of entail required amendment, and he proposed by the first bill, to provide that any property entailed in future in Scotland should be entailed upon a plan practically similar to the law of England, but adapted to the law of Scotland. By the second bill he proposed to provide, that persons in possession of entailed estates, should receive certain powers over those estates, which were very much wanted, to enable parties in possession of property to do justice to their estates. By the third bill he proposed to enact, that on the expiration of the lives of all persons interested in property at the passing of this Act, it shall be in the power of the first unborn heir to make a new settlement of the estate, and thus that the principle of the old law shall, as relates to their successors, become merged in that of the new law. By this provision, the existing law would not be altered until the demise of all heirs in being. He neither wished nor intended to enter into any discussion on the merits of the bills upon the present occasion. The law of Scotland upon this point had already been much discussed by the committees upstairs, by the House, and by a great portion of the Scotch people, and he only wished to introduce the bills now, in order that ample time might be given for their consideration. With this object in view, he should simply move for leave to bring them in, and then suffer them to lie over until after the holidays. Though anxious not to detain the House, he could not help remarking, that the law had not been found to secure the objects for which it was provided, and every object which the Legislature had in view when that law was passed had been defeated. So injurious, indeed, had been its operation, that, in many cases, it had had the effect of reducing to poverty, affluent persons, whose property was entailed. To these brief observations upon the general subject, he would take the liberty of adding, that, considering the peculiar times in which we live, a revision and a correction of the abuses of the law of entail, was a matter of serious importance. A very considerable, perhaps the greater portion of the landed property of Scotland is entailed. Under the existing law it is impossible that improvements upon property of this kind can be effected, in very many cases, which under a different law might be done with much benefit, not only to the individuals concerned, but to a large portion of the people of Scotland, who would then have an important source of employment opened to them. Of the necessity of affording employment to the agricultural poor, convincing proofs had lately been given in this part of the empire; but the House could hardly be aware of the very extensive field which would be opened to the industry of the labouring classes in Scotland under a different law of entail, since much capital now unemployed might then be most beneficially laid out upon land. Such a consideration at the present time should attach an additional importance to the subject. He trusted, therefore, that no objection would be made to the introduction of the bills already known to the House. He felt called upon by consistency, and by the regard which he naturally entertained for the country with which he was connected, to renew that which must be admitted by every one to be a most difficult task, but from which, in the absence of others better qualified than himself, he would not shrink. The hon. Member concluded by making the motion he mentioned at the beginning of his speech.

Sir *George Clerk* admitted, that the subject of the law of entail in Scotland was of infinite importance, and required mature consideration; for which reason he should not offer the slightest opposition to the introduction of the bills. At the same time, however, his hon. friend must not suppose, because the introduction of the bills was not opposed—that the Members for Scotland would, therefore, cordially support every detail of the measures. Everybody must be aware of the importance of the law of entail in Scotland, where so much property is entailed, although there was still sufficient land unentailed in Scotland to prevent any great mischief arising from a deficiency of means to afford employment to the agricultural poor. The hon. and learned Gentleman was quite mistaken in supposing that there is no field for the employment of capital in the purchase of land in Scotland. At this very moment a greater portion of the surface of Scotland was for sale than of any other part of the empire. If the hon. and learned Member's bills were precisely the same as those of last year, he must oppose some of their provisions. He was prepared to amend this branch of the Scotch law to a certain extent; but if either of the bills contained any proposition for a repeal of the Act passed seven years ago, and from which Scotland had derived the greatest advantages, he should certainly feel himself bound to oppose it. He would not go into any detail at the present moment; but as it was one in which the interests of Scotland were deeply involved, he trusted that it would meet with the attention which such a measure deserved, and that a proper opportunity would be allowed for discussing it. He regretted to say, that bills upon this subject had not hitherto met with that degree of attention from either House of Parliament which their importance demanded. With respect to the third measure proposed by the hon. Member, he had not yet heard anything to induce him to assent to it, and he therefore gave him notice that he should hereafter uniformly oppose it, though he would not object to their motion.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* trusted that this most important subject would meet with greater attention than it did in the last Session of Parliament. To judge, however, from the conduct of hon. Members during the discussion this evening, he could hardly flatter himself that this would be the case. He was quite satisfied that if any one had come into the House while the hon. member for Ayr was moving for leave to introduce these bills, he would never have supposed that any real or important business was under discussion, for during the time that his hon. and learned friend was addressing the House, he was perfectly sure that only those who were sitting close to him could have formed the slightest idea of the subject upon which he was speaking. The confusion was so great, that not one word of the first part of his hon. friend's address could be heard, even by those who sat only a very short distance from him. It was not upon this occasion only that he had to complain of the inattention and manifest indifference of the majority of those hon. Members who appeared to come to the House only to amuse themselves, by conversing upon subjects not connected with the business of the House. What with the talking, laughing, and general inattention of the greater part of the House, it was quite impossible that matters of this kind,—more dry than interesting, perhaps, to those who sought only entertainment, but not on that account the less important—could be maturely or properly considered. The measures to which his hon. and learned friend had endeavoured to call the attention of the House were very important as regarded Scotland. There had been nothing like them since the period of the Union, because by them it was proposed to put an end to the system upon which the property of Scotland had hitherto rested. Although it was not his intention to oppose these measures, he was of opinion that there would be some objection to their being carried the length which his hon. and learned friend proposed. The subject required the utmost consideration, and he would therefore entreat for it the most serious attention of the Members of every part of the kingdom. Some change was necessary in this branch of the Scotch law, because all the purposes for which the law of entail was originally made have been defeated by subsequent Acts of Parliament. The principle of the old law, for many years past, had been entirely departed from, and many abuses and much injustice had been occasioned. It became highly important, therefore, that some measure should be adopted which would carry into effect the real intentions of the Legislature. The principle of the old law in Scotland was, that every successive heir should come into possession of his ancestors' estates free and unencumbered. Subsequent Acts, however, had defeated that principle. The Montgomery Act, together with Lord Aberdeen's Act, have so put down the interests of heirs of entail, by allowing provisions for widows and families, that persons now inheriting property by entail in Scotland, instead of possessing, as they would formerly, a handsome income, are reduced to a state of comparative poverty. To the two bills, therefore, framed for the purpose of giving relief to heirs of entail, he should give his hearty concurrence, although he doubted the possibility of ever assimilating the laws of England and Scotland upon this point without causing too great a change in the law of Scotland. He trusted that the bills would meet with the favourable consideration of the House, and especially, he trusted that those who, from their official situations, might be termed the guardians of the law of Scotland, would devote their attention to the subject, and he hoped, therefore, before the second reading of the bills that an opportunity would be afforded to these learned persons duly to consider them. It would also be highly advisable, in his opinion, that the Judges of Scotland should be consulted upon the subject, so that the measures might be finally submitted to this House in such a shape as to render them as free as possible from any objection.

Sir *William Rae* thought, considering the importance of the subject, independently of the very able observations of his hon. and learned friend, that it would be quite impossible for the House to resist the introduction of these measures. But the subject of Scotch entails was certainly one of the most difficult that could possibly be taken up by an individual Member; and it was, therefore, with much regret that he had heard that there was no chance of its being taken up by the other House of Parliament, which, from the attendance of the Judges of the land, possessed greater facilities for properly discussing measures of this kind than the Commons. He looked upon any measure for the purpose of improving the law of Scotland which had its origin in that House, almost with despair, for it required the sanction of the very first law authorities.

Mr. *Kennedy* wished to offer one word in explanation, for the purpose of guarding himself against the imputation of having had the presumption to submit, upon his sole authority, any measure upon a subject of such vast importance as that of the Scotch law of entail. The House would recollect that two Select Committees had been appointed in former Sessions to consider the subject, and these bills embodied what those committees recommended as proper to amend the law. He was fully aware, that it would be the height of presumption in him to incur the responsibility of introducing such measures; but, in addition to the recommendation of the committees, these measures had received the approbation of a very learned and eminent Scotch Judge—Sir James Moncrief. Backed by such authorities he had undertaken the difficult task of endeavouring to carry these measures through Parliament.

Leave was given to bring in the Tailzies Regulation, the Tailzies Relief, and the Tailzies Amendment (Scotland) Bills.

Returns of the Metropolitan Police.] Mr. *Lamb* moved to discharge the Order which had been made for certain Returns respecting the Metropolitan Police, for the purpose of substituting a more extended Motion, in the form of an Address, including Returns of all Monies collected in the several Districts of the Metropolis for the payment of the Police Force now in existence; also, for Returns of the former Expenses of Nightly Watch and Day Police, with an account of all sums expended in preparing Station Houses, *&c. &c.*

Mr. *Ridley Colborne* took that occasion to advert to the state of the disturbed districts in the vicinity of the metropolis, and of other parts of the country in the same condition, urging the necessity of issuing Special Commissions for all those Counties in which there had been disturbances for the trial of offenders. He wished to press upon his Majesty's Government the necessity which existed of making such arrangements as would prevent parties accused from being tried by the Magistrates by whom they had been committed, and with whom they might have come into personal conflict.

Lord *Althorp* had to state, for the information of his hon. friend, that in addition to the Commission already issued, another had passed the Great Seal for the trial of offenders in Buckinghamshire. There would be, in the issue of many more Commissions, considerable difficulty in finding Judges to try the accused. He fully concurred with his hon. friend, that none of those persons ought to be tried by the Magistrates under whose warrants they were committed, or by any person liable to be swayed by local, or any other undue influence.

Sir *R. Peel* observed, that the Returns which had been moved for could not be complete unless the expense of private watchmen were included in it. Several of the parishes in the metropolis had, from the necessity of the case, been compelled to employ private watchmen; for there was, in some parishes no rate for the purpose of defraying the expense of watching. To obtain Returns showing the cost of private watchmen would be obviously impossible, and without them it would be impracticable to discover the difference between the expense of the present and the old systems.

Mr. *Wilks* observed, that notwithstanding the police was said to be so good, the people would not in many cases give up their private watchmen; and with that the increase of expense was very great. Thus in Newington, Lambeth, the rates had been raised from 3,000*l.* to 4,390*l.* a-year; in Christ Church from 1,200*l.* to 2,100*l.*; and in St. George's, Hanover-square, from 5,000*l.* to 17,000*l.*; and in all these places he believed that the number of protectors by night was less than before. He was of opinion, that the fullest possible information ought to be obtained, and he had every hope that when a Committee was appointed to inquire into the state of the police of the metropolis, it would be found that the expense could be considerably diminished, and that some portion of it ought to be defrayed from the Consolidated Fund, and not exclusively made chargeable upon the parishes.

Mr. *Lamb* undertook to obtain all possible information from parochial authorities, and otherwise, respecting the expense. He was well aware that a number of private watchmen were employed, for even yet some old ladies desired to have the hour called at night.

An Address for the various Returns was then agreed to.

Charitable Institutions.] Alderman *Thompson* moved the second reading of the Charitable Institutions' Bill, in doing which he observed, that Charitable Institutions were exposed to very great hardships, and the designs of the benevolent were defeated to a very great extent, in consequence of the right assumed by Parochial Authorities, of making an assessment for Poor-rates upon property that was, and ought to be, exclusively devoted to charitable purposes. Bethlehem Hospital was rated at 2,500*l.* a-year. The Trustees appealed to the Magistrates in Quarter Sessions assembled, but the Magistrates informed them that they could afford no remedy. They then appealed to the humanity and justice of the Parochial Authorities, but with similar success. The Trustees of Bethlehem Hospital alleged, most truly, that they had under their care no less than eighty-five paupers, who but for that establishment would have become chargeable upon the parish in which their house was situated. He denied that the Charity in question had accumulated property to the amount stated in the petitions presented against the Bill, and as to the ground that they occupied in the parish, he thought the objection founded upon that was fully met by the fact of the number of paupers they maintained.

Mr. *N. Calvert* said, he had been intrusted with a petition to present against the Bill. He had been informed that the Bethlehem Hospital trustees had realised property from their surplus income to the amount of 14,000*l.* The rate levied some time since upon the Hospital was only one shilling in the pound —it had since been reduced to ninepence, and he really thought that the Trustees ought not to be unwilling to pay so small a rate for lighting and improving the ways leading to their princely establishment. Guy's and St. Thomas's Hospitals both paid rates, and he therefore did not see why Bethlehem was to be excepted. So large a portion of the parish was occupied by Hospitals, that unless they were rated the rates collected would be trifling.

Mr. Alderman *Winchester* supported the Bill. The whole of the funds of such an institution ought to be applied to charitable purposes.

Sir *R. Wilson* said, that he should oppose the Bill, because he looked upon it as one which was unjust in its principles, and which had been introduced at a most unseasonable time, as there was great distress in the particular district to which it had reference. The whole of the district of St. George's consisted but of 130 acres, of which thirty were occupied by charitable institutions.

Mr. *Wilks* said, that it was distinctly enacted, that all charitable institutions should be liable to pay rates, and he did not see any good reason why the Hospitals in St. George's parish should be exempted from that rule.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* said, that if Bethlehem Hospital were made to pay rates, it must come on the County for funds to support the paupers it now maintained.

Mr. *Maberly* thought, on the contrary, that if the institutions were exonerated, the charge it now sustained would fall on poor householders, and would be ruin to them.

Mr. *Hughes Hughes* would oppose the Bill, but he recommended that a middle course should be adopted, and the Hospital pay the rates on a reduced scale.

Mr. *Briscoe* opposed the Bill, because he thought that the rates would then fall too heavily upon the poor inhabitants of the district.

The House divided: For the Second Reading 36; Against it 70.—Majority against the Bill 34.

Improvement of the Game Laws.] On the second reading of the Game Bill being moved,

Mr. *Fyler* complained of the cumbrous form in which this Bill was submitted to the House. In his opinion, it would be quite sufficient to make every man a trespasser who came on another man's land with a gun in his hand. With respect to qualifications, he thought the whole system was bad: a man with 100,000*l.* in the funds could not shoot, while a captain, because the King had signed his commission, had a right to shoot. He maintained that the whole system was founded in error, and led to crime. Let him not be told that, without the Game-laws, country gentlemen would not live in the country: they had now something better to do there than to look after the preservation of pheasants. He was glad that we had got a Government which would revise these and other objectionable laws; and he hoped the Government would take up the subject. If it did not, and if this Bill were got rid of, he would, after the recess bring in a measure to do away with the objectionable points, and render the offence a simple trespass.

Colonel *Wood* thought, that the hon. Gentleman had contented himself with merely counting the clauses, without reading them; for, if he had done so, he would have found that almost all the provisions he spoke of were introduced. He meant to support the second reading of the Bill. At the same time, he thought that the details were too much loaded. The two great points that were required were the legalizing the sale of game, so that the public should be supplied; and the equalizing the law for the poor and the rich. At present there was one law for an opulent man, and another for those who were not wealthy. He wished also that every owner of land should have the power to give permission to sport over it to whomever he pleased.

Mr. *Curteis* supported the second reading of the Bill, on the understanding that more alterations would take place in the committee. The fundamental principle that he would lay down was, that it was the first right of every individual to do what he would with the game on his own property, whether that property consisted of one acre or a thousand. He wished the sale of game to be permitted, and he would abolish all manorial rights.

Lord *J. Russell* thought, that the present Bill was a great improvement on any previous one, though he did not think that it reached that point of simplicity and justice which was necessary. For himself, he had always thought that the system of the Game-laws had been most pernicious to the interests of the country. With respect to qualifications, he thought that this Bill did not go far enough; besides, there was every reason to expect that the law would be evaded on this head; and the point they ought to look to was, to make a law that should so agree with the pervading spirit of the times as not to make people desirous of evading it. He hoped the Bill might be so amended in the committee as to make it a great improvement of the present law, and enable the Parliament to say that it had done something to clear out this blot on the country, and something to reconcile the people of England to the landed aristocracy of the country.

Mr. *Warburton* congratulated the House and the country that the time had at length arrived when they had a prospect of getting rid of the Game-laws—laws the most disgraceful and odious that ever existed. He certainly did not think the Bill perfect in its present shape, but he hoped that it might be so modified in the committee as to be made acceptable to the country. He thought the Government could on no account neglect to take the measure into its own hands, or at least give it such support as to ensure its success. The Game-laws filled our gaols with men guilty of no crime worthy of such a punishment; and though he did not wholly approve of the present Bill, he would cheerfully assent to it, on the principle of entering the small end of the wedge, and hereafter driving it home. He knew of no such laws as our Game-laws in any other country, unless, indeed, it was in some of the Islands of the Pacific Ocean. He had read in Mariner's account of the Tonga Islands, that there the rats were preserved as game; and though everybody might eat rats, nobody was allowed to kill them, but somebody descended from their gods or their kings. That was the only country and the only case he knew of, which furnished anything like a parallel to our Game-laws. He was satisfied that the time was at length come when these laws would be abolished; and he hoped the House would now read the Bill a second time, resolved to amend it in the committee.

Lord *Althorp* agreed in all the observations which had been made by his noble friend, and in those made by the noble Lord who had introduced the Bill; and he could assure the noble Lord, that the Government would be very happy to cooperate with him in making any improvements which might be requisite in the committee, and it would give the Bill every attention. He was happy that the Bill had been brought in; and he could assure the House, that the Government would readily support any measures that could improve the present system. Certainly, that system which filled our gaols with hardy men, with the most active and intelligent of our population, and educated them in vice, associated them with criminals, and then turned them loose on the country, prepared for all kinds of crimes—certainly, such a system could not be too soon altered. He should support the Bill, though he hoped it might be so altered in the committee as to make the measure satisfactory to the House and the country.

Mr. *C. Tennant* would be happy to support a measure for abolishing the Game-laws; but he could not support this measure, because it did not go far enough. He wished, indeed, that there should be no amendment of these laws, in order that their enormities might the sooner bring about their total abolition. The Bill did not go far enough, and Members would be disposed to go further if they only remembered that those laws were the remains of a barbarous age, and of an odious and barbarous system of tyranny. It would only be necessary to keep the laws unaltered a little longer to get rid of them altogether. The hon. Member had spoken of this Bill as a boon; he did not so consider it, for he thought the law of trespass was all that was required to protect game. He had not read the Bill, but he knew what it was, and he should oppose the Bill at every stage. He was not known to the House, but he would divide it on this question, in order that the country might see how many Members would commit themselves to the principle of the Bill, and how many would support the total abolition. The hon. Member concluded by moving that the Bill be read a second time that day six months.

Mr. *Warburton* explained, that he was no more friendly to those laws than the hon. Member, and he did not think that he gave his approbation to them by supporting a Bill to amend them.

Mr. *William Duncombe* expressed his astonishment at the speech of the hon. Member who had just sat down. He was astonished that the hon. Gentleman should have taken such an extraordinary method of making himself known to the House, as to oppose a Bill which he acknowledged he had not read. The principle of the Bill was, to render game saleable, which it had never yet been in this country, and that would be a great boon. Everybody agreed that the time was come when an alteration should be made in the Game-laws, and nobody supposed that that reform ought to be delayed. If the hon. Member's Amendment were carried, it would at least delay the reform till another year. He would cordially support the Bill.

Mr. *John Wood* thought the hon. Member who opposed the Bill, and who, he knew, had paid much attention to this subject out of doors, had mistaken its operation, and the effect of rejecting it. The hon. Member was probably not aware that, by rejecting the Bill at that stage, he implied that he was hostile to its principle, or hostile to the improvement of the Game-laws. He recommended that the Bill should be made as perfect as possible in the committee. In his own opinion, the owner of land should be the owner of the game on it; and a man with a single rood of ground should be as well entitled to kill game on it as the owner of many acres. As to tenants, their right to kill game should be settled, like their other rights, by contract. On these principles—principles which he considered just—he would amend the Bill; and if it were not passed this year, many months would not elapse before it would be found as expedient to pass a bill so amended, as the Bill itself would be just in principle.

Sir *Robert Bateson* hoped that the Bill might be extended to Ireland, as it would confer great benefits on that country.

The Marquis of *Chandos* said, that the hon. member for Coventry had not treated him fairly, in describing his Bill as a provocative to crime: he meant it to prevent crime. His own preserves, which had been alluded to, were not kept, as had been insinuated, by an army, but by the good will of the farmers; and he relied on that much more than an armed keeper for the security of his game. As to what had been said by the hon. Member who had not read the Bill, he could assure him that he was not to be deterred by any sneers from proceeding with the Bill, or from proceeding with any measure which would give relief to the labourers, to whom he was as friendly as the hon. Member, or any other hon. Gentleman.

Mr. *Fyler* explained, that he said the Game-laws, and not the noble Lord's Bill, were a provocative to crime.

Mr. C. Tennant withdrew his Amendment. Bill read a second time.

Corn Laws—Scarcity.] Mr. *John Wood*, in moving for a number of Returns, to show the quantity of bonded corn on hand, and the quantity imported from different countries since the beginning of last year, took the opportunity to condemn, in strong terms, our present system of taking the Averages. It was, he said, the most fallacious possible, and they could, at any time, be altered a few shillings by one or two great speculators. He knew that in some places not one particle of the corn that was consumed for several weeks ever formed part of the averages. He wished, also, to take that opportunity to warn the Government and the country, that we were placed, he believed, in a very critical situation as to the quantity of corn in the country. The stock, he believed, was small, and was fast diminishing. He did not believe that there were above 300,000 quarters in bond, and he dreaded the approach of a famine price. There was no large stock in any part of the Continent, whence we could obtain supplies. One of the arguments, he remembered, of those who supported the Corn-laws was, that the country ought not to depend for a supply of food on foreign countries; but it was impossible that it could grow food enough for all its inhabitants. The policy, therefore, of this country ought to be, to encourage other countries to grow food for our use. What was the consequence, however, of the policy we had pursued? The harvest last season was below the average, and there was now no corn to be got from the Continent. We could get none from the Baltic and none from the opposite coast. We might, perhaps, get a little from the Mediterranean, or a little from America; but he thought the supplies we could obtain were so short, that he would recommend capitalists and persons engaged in this trade to look about them and see whence they could obtain supplies. At present the price of wheat in the month of December was 64*s*., and it was the opinion of experienced persons, that by the month of June it would be 100*s*. He believed it, and he thought that scarcity would best be prevented by the Government and the country directing their attention to the subject in time, and by such warnings as he thought it his duty to give. The hon. Member concluded by moving for the Returns above-mentioned.

Mr. *Curteis* shared the hon. Member's opinions as to the Averages, and thought the Return would be useful. He must deny the latter part of the hon. Gentleman's statement, however, and believed that there was no ground for the fears he had expressed.

Mr. *Ruthven* also thought, that the crops of last year were not so deplorably bad as the hon. Gentleman stated. He admitted that the averages were fallacious, but he could not agree that the Corn-laws were altogether wrong. It was necessary to give protection to the agriculturists, but he thought that protection might probably be better given by a regular fixed duty than by the present method of taking the averages.

Returns ordered.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, Dec. 8.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. For the abolition of Slavery, by Lord WHARNCLIFFE, and Lord FARNHAM, from Stockwell, Wotton-under-Edge, Mansfield, Barnsley, and Wimborne. By Lord KING, from Blackburn, for a repeal of the Stamp Duties on Newspapers.

REPEAL OF THE UNION WITH IRELAND.] The Marquis of *Ormonde* presented a Petition from Kilkenny, complaining of distress, and praying for a Repeal of the Union. The noble Marquis stated it as his conviction, that a Repeal of the Union would be a most disastrous measure to both countries.

Lord *Clifden* quite concurred in that opinion. He did not know any thing that would be more disastrous to Ireland than a repeal of the Union. He really believed, that if their Lordships thought fit to erect Ireland into an entirely separate State, and to send to the Continent—to Prussia, Austria, or Russia, for some Prince to place as a sovereign there, they could not more completely lay the foundation of the utter ruin and subversion of the empire, than by repealing the Union. He would assert, that ninety-nine out of a hundred men of property in Ireland,—that all respectable persons, Catholics and Protestants, were against a repeal of the Union. No man was a greater friend than he (Lord Clifden) was to an effectual and proper reform, but he was at the same time decidedly opposed to universal suffrage, radical reform, and the repeal of the Union.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR OF IRELAND.] Lord *Farnham* regretted that he did not see the noble Earl at the head of his

Majesty's Government in his place, as he wished to put a question to him, which the absence of that noble Earl yesterday had alone prevented him from putting. He trusted that he should not, in the observations he was about to make, be considered as offering any hostility towards the noble Lords in whom it had pleased his Majesty to repose his confidence. He was one of those who were strongly of opinion, that the more the administration of justice could be separated from political considerations the better it would be for the public. He therefore lamented exceedingly that the constitution of our Government was such as to make it necessary that the place filled by the learned Lord upon the Woolsack should be a political situation. If, however, it were necessary that the Great Seal of England should be confided to a person in the Cabinet, he did not see any reason why the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland should be held by a person politically connected with the existing Government. He had heard a report that it was the intention of his Majesty's Ministers to remove Sir A. Hart from the Chancellorship of Ireland, in order to make room for a person for whose talents he entertained the greatest respect—he meant Lord Plunkett. He was in hopes that his Majesty's Ministers were determined to redeem the pledges which they had given to enforce the most rigid economy in every department of the State. Now one great objection to the arrangement which he had mentioned was, that it would have the effect of saddling the public with an additional and unnecessary expense of 4,000*l.* a year; and as soon as such an arrangement could be completed, they would have no less than six Chancellors and ex-Chancellors, and in the present unsettled state of politics, he should not be at all surprised if, in a short period, they should have two more retired Chancellors upon the list. It was a common, and a prudent practice in private families, to make a provision to prevent the estate from being encumbered by too many settlements. It struck him that such a case was strictly analogous to that of the great estate of the nation, and therefore, that in the case of retired Chancellors, no more pensions should be settled upon them until some of the antecedent dowagers had dropped off. He was not personally acquainted with the learned person who was about being removed from the Chancellorship of Ireland, but he understood that he had filled that high situation in such a manner as to give universal satisfaction to the suitors to his Court—to the Bar, and the public, of that country. He meant to say nothing in disparagement of the noble Lord who was to succeed him, when he said, that he had only to imitate the conduct of his predecessor to give equally general satisfaction. Perhaps, indeed, if the arrangement spoken of had been made, it had been framed upon economical principles, and he wished to give Ministers an opportunity to explain the details of such an arrangement. Looking at it *prima facie*, such a change as that to which he had alluded but ill accorded with that rigid economy to which his Majesty's Ministers had pledged themselves.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that nothing could be more fair or candid than the questions which had been asked by the noble Lord, and he only regretted that he had to state in reply that, at present, nothing in the way of minute information could be obtained upon the points to which those questions referred, not merely on account of the absence of his noble friend, at the head of his Majesty's Government, to whose department every question regarding economy more particularly related, but also because, in point of time, the questions themselves were premature. The noble Lord had said, that he had heard that the arrangements in question had been framed upon economical principles, and that he wished to give Ministers an opportunity of stating them to the House; but it must be evident to the noble Lord, that unless arrangements were completed, it would be impossible for the Government to take the opportunity of stating them to the House. With regard to his first question, it appeared that the noble Lord entertained the opinion, that the officer who discharged the judicial functions attached to the situation which he (the Lord Chancellor) filled in that House, and the officer who filled a similar situation in the sister kingdom, were not persons who should have seats in the Cabinet, or be politically connected with the Administration of the day. Now, whether or not it might be more desirable, for the better administration of justice in the country (using the word in the largest and most comprehensive sense), that the rule of separating the judicial from the political functions of Judges should be departed from in one instance,—namely, that of the person holding the Great Seal—whether or not it was better, for the Administration of Justice, that such a deviation should be made from that otherwise excellent principle, was a question of not less difficulty than importance. At the first sight, every person who would consider the question would be inclined to give a decision in the negative, and to agree with the noble Lord in thinking that there was a clashing between the political and judicial functions of that office, and that they should be, therefore, severed from each other. On the other hand, it would appear that there was vested in the office which he (the Lord Chancellor) now held, a certain peculiar and exclusive and varied jurisdiction, on account of which it had been deemed necessary hitherto that such an office should be filled by a person politically connected with the Government. There was no precedent, certainly, for the separation which the noble Lord now called for, and if such a measure were adopted, it would be the greatest change that had ever been introduced into the Administration of Justice in this country, —one, at the same time, which would be contrary to all the precedents that we had since the time when the office of Lord Chancellor was known in this country, and which would put that great branch of the Civil Justice of the country upon a footing on which it had never been before. He did not deny that such a proposition might form a very fit subject for discussion, and if it were brought forward with that notice and preparation which so important a measure deserved, he pledged himself that he would not be found wanting to take his part in such a discussion. But, however the case might be in England, the noble Lord had asked, why not effect such a separation in Ireland? He (the Lord Chancellor) had known a great number of Lord Chancellors in that country, and he had no recollection of any one of them who was not removed upon a change of Administration. In 1801, when Lord Sidmouth became Premier, Lord Redesdale succeeded to the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland; in 1804, when Lord Sidmouth went out of office, Lord Redesdale certainly did not go out, but that was no instance against the rule, Lord Eldon continuing in office in England, because the principles of the Administration remained the same. The death of Mr. Pitt occasioned a change of Administration in the beginning of 1806. Lord Redesdale then came back from Ireland, and was succeeded by the late Mr. George Ponsonby. In the following year, 1807, another change of Ministry took place. The Duke of Portland and Mr. Perceval came into power, and the intimate friend of both, Lord Manners, was appointed to the office of Chancellor of Ireland, which he held till the end of Lord Liverpool's Administration. Then, as soon as the convenient arrangements could be made, the same rule was again applied in England and Ireland. Lord Eldon retired in this country, and Sir A. Hart succeeded Lord Manners in Ireland, who only continued to hold office until the arrangements were made to provide his successor. In all those instances the same rule had been applied in England and Ireland, and he could not see that there was any thing which distinguished the Irish Chancellor from the English Chancellor to justify a departure from that rule. The change recommended by the noble Lord would be a most serious one in England, but it would be also one of very serious importance in Ireland. He was sure the noble Lord would admit that no charge lay against his Majesty's Ministers for not departing from a rule which all former Governments had acted upon. It might be departed from hereafter, if the Legislature should give its sanction to such an alteration, as it had already to other alterations in our judicial system; but Ministers could not be charged with a dereliction of their duty because they awaited the wisdom of Parliament to make, if it should think fit, such an unusual and unprecedented change in the Administration of Justice. The noble Lord had asked whether or not the Government had given directions for making the change he had mentioned with regard to the person who had filled the office of Lord Chancellor in Ireland. To that he would without hesitation reply, that nothing as yet had been finally done. If he were asked whether such a change was in contemplation, he did not feel himself bound to answer such a question. Whenever his Majesty's Ministers made up their minds, they would state their intentions to Parliament, but it was not his duty to state what they had in contemplation.

He would tell the noble Lord however, frankly and sincerely, though the matter had not been finally determined on, that his own leaning was towards such a change. The noble Lord had drawn an example from a private estate, with regard to which provision was often made to prevent its being encumbered with more than a certain amount of settlements. That might be a very good arrangement with respect to a private estate, but no instance had occurred where a pension had not been granted to a retired Chancellor. He would take upon him to assert, that though no arrangements had been finally made, either as to the terms upon which the Great Seal of Ireland should be held, or upon what terms the alteration should be effected, if such an alteration (of which he admitted the possibility) should take place, and though he could not be expected to state the details of that which was hardly commenced, much less completed—he would take the liberty to state, that when the details came to be laid before their Lordships, the plan would be found to have been conceived and made out with the strictest regard to economy. He was satisfied, that if such a change should take place, it would be found that the salaries would be modified as they had never been before, and so modified as to produce a saving—small, perhaps, in amount, but still a saving to the public; and he was also satisfied that the arrangements would be found quite consistent with the due economy of the public money.

[In the early part of the evening the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod acquainted their Lordships that he had taken a person into custody, who had been seen lurking about the House, and was suspected of having dangerous weapons in his possession, and who had attempted to take away the life of one of the Marshalmen attending the House, though the pistol missed fire. With this man he waited their Lordships' pleasure. At a later period of the evening the following Motion was made :]

Case of Francis Sisk—Public Processions.] Viscount *Melbourne* said, that their Lordships were probably aware that there was in the custody of the officer of that House an individual charged with the commission of a heinous offence within their Lordships' jurisdiction. It was equally probable, however, that their Lordships would generally be of opinion that the most proper and convenient course to follow on this occasion was, to order the individual in question to be handed over to the Civil power, in order that he should be dealt with according to the ordinary process of the Courts of Law. He would, therefore, move, that Francis Sisk, now in the custody of the Usher of the Black Rod, be delivered over to the Civil power, in order to be dealt with acccording to law.

The Duke of *Wellington* wished to take that opportunity to advert to a matter which was of much more importance than the conduct of an individual,—he meant the procession which had taken place that day, through the streets of the metropolis, to the Palace at St. James's. That procession had been attended by a large body of people; it had occasioned large assemblages in the streets through which it had passed; and he therefore begged leave to call the attention of the noble Lord (the Secretary for the Home Department) to the circumstance, if it had not already attracted his attention. It seemed to him to be a very important matter, and as such he wished to hear what steps had been taken with respect to it.

Viscount *Melbourne* said, that he was glad the noble Duke had called their Lordships' attention to the transaction, and he would, in a few words, give them a satisfactory explanation as to the whole circumstance from the beginning, and the whole course of proceeding which had led to the procession alluded to by the noble Duke. Almost the day after that upon which he had received the Seals of Office, he was waited upon by a deputation of the united trades of the City of London, who stated, that in consequence of the very severe disappointment which the City had experienced from the putting off his Majesty's visit to the Lord Mayor, they were anxious to be allowed to present an Address to his Majesty, to testify their loyalty to his Majesty, and their firm attachment to the Laws and Constitution of the realm. Seeing no objection whatever to the presentation of such an Address, the more especially as they stated that it would be presented by a deputation of three individuals at the levee, he undoubtedly took his Majesty's pleasure concerning it: and his Majesty was graciously pleased to give his assent to its presentation. It was then understood that it was to be presented by three individuals, in the ordinary manner, at the levee. In the course of yesterday, he was greatly surprised, however, by learning from handbills which were laid before him, and which had been posted up in the different streets of the metropolis, calling on all the trades to unite and meet together to accompany this deputation to St. James's Palace, that the trades intended to have a public procession. On inquiry, he thought it necessary to take some measures as soon as possible, and he immediately consulted all the civil authorities on the subject, the heads of the police departments, the magistrates, &c., and they were all distinctly of opinion, that it would be much better to suffer the procession to take place, as proposed, than to prevent it by authority. They stated, that if the procession were allowed to proceed, they would be answerable for the consequences, and for the complete preservation of the public peace along the whole line it would have to traverse. Under these circumstances, he thought it should be allowed to take place, and that no measures of a strong nature should be adopted to put it down. He had now reason to be pleased with having followed these suggestions, for the procession had taken place in the most tranquil manner, and without any disturbance whatever of the public peace. He trusted, therefore, their Lordships would think, that, under all the circumstances, he had adopted the wisest course in not interfering with the wishes of the people.

The *Lord Chancellor* wished to add one word to what had fallen from his noble friend. The number of the persons assembled was certainly great, inconveniently great, of course, because the assembling of large numbers must always be more or less dangerous to the public peace. Still, however, if great numbers of the trades, or of other persons, were to say that they should like to see their Sovereign, or to accompany those who carried up an Address, how were their Lordships to prevent them doing so? The people might walk the streets if they pleased, and St. James's-street or Pall Mall were not exceptions; and they might walk with or without banners, the law would not justify any interference, much less the exertion of force, unless there was a probability of a breach of the peace. There was no such probability in this case; and he must say, he quite agreed in the advice which was given to his noble friend by those persons who were certainly very competent to advise in such a case, because they were the persons who, being answerable for the preservation of the peace, must be most alive to any danger of the peace being broken. The assemblage was no doubt to be regretted, but to be regretted only because all assemblages of large numbers were inconvenient. Nevertheless, the assemblage was perfectly legal. Before he left the Palace he had been careful to ascertain how these persons had conducted themselves, and he had found that their demeanour, as they passed along the streets, and while they were waiting outside the Palace, was perfectly quiet and peaceable. Though they lingered sometime about the Palace, probably in the expectation that his Majesty might appear at one of the windows, and that so they might obtain a sight of their Sovereign: although his Majesty did not appear, yet they expressed no symptom of impatience or disappointment, and committed no outrages, or behaved in any manner incompatible with good order, and the preservation of public peace.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, that he did not know that the Government had received any information upon the subject, or he should not have mentioned it. As to the assemblage being a legal one,—he had not the Act of Parliament by him,—but he believed it to be altogether illegal. He thought such a proceeding contrary to the law. However, it was without any knowledge of those circumstances which the noble Viscount had stated, that he had felt it his duty to call the attention of the noble Viscount thus publicly to the subject,—and he must say, if such an assemblage were not contrary to the law, it was certainly extremely dangerous to the public peace.

Motion agreed to, and the man was given up to the civil authorities.*

---

* The individual referred to in the Debate, after being examined before the Magistrates, was committed to Newgate. He was subsequently tried and acquitted of the intent to murder, but ordered to be shut up in Bedlam as insane.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, Dec. 8.

Minutes.] New Writ. For the Borough of Dungannon, the hon. Thomas Knox having accepted the Chiltern Hundreds.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Sir J. Newport, the Receipts of First Fruits in Ireland since 1812:—On the Motion of Sir Wm. Rae, the number of instruments of Sasine recorded in Scotland between January 1, 1829, and January 1, 1830, and the expense.

Petitions presented. Against Negro Slavery, by Colonel Powell, from a place in Cardiganshire:—By Alderman Waithman, four from places in Wales:—By Mr. Russell, from a body of Methodists in Durham:—By Mr. Knight, two from Wallingford:—By Colonel Tyrell, from Cockfield, and another place in Essex:—By the Earl of Uxbridge, from Beaumaris; and another Petition from Holyhead:—By Colonel Sibthorp, from the City of Lincoln:—By the Marquis of Graham, from Cambridge:—By Lord G. Somerset, five from places in Monmouthshire:—By Mr. Wilks, six from different Congregations of Dissenters:—By Lord Ashley, from Dorchester:—By Mr. Byng, three from Islington and Tottenham:—By Mr. Egerton, four from places in Cheshire:—By Mr. Legh Keck, from Hinckley. By Mr. Lambert, from a parish in Galway, for the benefits of the Elective Franchise:—By the Earl of Uxbridge, from Galway:—By Mr. O'Hara, from the Soap-boilers of Galway, for a Repeal of Duties. By Sir J. Newport, from the Parish of St. John, Waterford, praying for a Repeal of the Union. By Mr. Byng, from St. John's, Shadwell, complaining of the New Police and the Land-Tax:—By Mr. Legh Keck, from Hinckley, for the Repeal of the House and Window Taxes:—By Mr. J. Johnstone, from Stirling, for a Reform of Scotch Burghs.

Stamps on Newspapers.] Mr. *Strutt* rose to present a petition, signed by a very numerous body of operatives of Derby, praying for a repeal of the Stamp duties upon Newspapers. The petitioners set forth, that being unable to purchase Newspapers, there had been established among them a cheap paper, which related solely to subjects of literature and of trade. No sooner had the paper obtained a circulation than the conductors of it received a notice from the Stamp-office that it was liable to a Stamp-duty, and the publication was obliged to be suppressed. The petitioners set forth their case to the Government, saying, "You prevent the poor acquiring knowledge, and then punish them for what is the effect of ignorance; leave us to ourselves, and we will educate ourselves." The hon. Member continued, that after what some of the members of the present Administration had said upon this subject on former occasions, he trusted that they would redeem their pledges to the country, by repealing the taxes upon Newspapers, and reduce all duties that operated as a tax upon literature and knowledge.

Mr. *J. Wood* said, that he should have to present a similar petition, signed by 2,300 operatives of Manchester. A work had been stopped by the Stamp-duties, which was effecting the greatest good among the poor, by enlightening their minds upon the subject of machinery. He believed the working classes to be very generally in favour of the present Government, but they expected it to redeem its pledge of reducing the taxes upon knowledge.

Mr. *Warburton* thought the petition worthy of notice, as containing a distinct denial by the petitioners of the opinion that the use of machinery was injurious to the working classes. The petitioners also stated, that with knowledge they would answer for the peace of the country. He thought his Majesty's Ministers could take no wiser step than to resolve to abolish all the stamp and other duties which impeded the progress of knowledge. Hitherto the education of the people had been both neglected and perverted, and now that they were disposed to educate themselves, it was too bad that the Government should prevent them, or in a manner hinder them by its taxes.

Petition to lie on the Table.

Duties on Sea-borne Coals.] Mr. *Wilks*, in presenting a petition against the duty upon Coals, which, he said, he was extremely solicitous to have repealed, as it pressed with excessive severity on the poor, wished to take that opportunity of asking the hon. member for Limerick whether he intended to bring forward his promised motion upon the subject; for if he abandoned it, other persons might take it up.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that under the present circumstances, he felt it would be improper to give any answer to the question, for whether he replied in the negative or affirmative, it might lead to inferences which he should not be prepared to support.

Mr. *Ormsby Gore* said, that in North Wales and in Ireland, the duty was very oppressive, and he hoped that it would be repealed. He thought that the continuance of the tax in Ireland was a violation of the Union.

Mr. *Warburton* supported the petition, and declared, that if the hon. member for Limerick gave up the task of moving for the repeal of these duties, that he would undertake that business after the Christmas recess.

General *Gascoyne* thought the question

could not be in better hands than those of the hon. member for Limerick.

Sir *R. Bateson* said, that the tax was a grievous injury to the Irish manufacturers and prevented them from thriving and extending the employment they could find for the poor. There was another tax—that on window glass—which was a great hindrance to the Irish peasant acquiring a love for comfort, and a great cause of the filthiness of their habitations, and of the diseases which prevailed amongst them. If these two taxes were repealed, the repeal of the Union would not be much in favour.

Sir *T. Acland* expressed a hope that the hon. member for Limerick would, if possible, persist in his motion on the subject; and pledged himself to take the matter up if the hon. Gentleman should consider it his duty to abandon it.

Mr. *O'Connell* was glad to hear it acknowledged that these duties were a violation of the Union, and was ready to bear his testimony to the injury they inflicted on the manufacturers of that country. With respect to the duties on window glass, they enhanced its price so much that it was quite beyond the means of the peasantry to purchase it. They were obliged to exclude both light and air from their cabins, and were made the victims of disease by the taxes of the Government.

Mr. *Brownlow* also bore testimony to the injurious effects of these taxes and expressed a hope that the hon. member for Limerick would not give up his intention. If the coal-duty were repealed, the vessels that bring cattle and corn from Ireland and go back empty, would take coals which would be a great advantage to the shipping interest.

Mr. *Calcraft* took occasion to deprecate the combination existing among the great coal-owners of the North to keep up the price of the article, and stated his fears that a remission of taxation on coals might prove more beneficial to those monopolists, who would scarcely fail to put the amount in their own pockets, than to the public.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* assured the hon. Member that there existed no grounds for his apprehensions. The competition between the coal-owners was sufficient to prevent the price of the article from being too high, and he had no doubt, that if the duty were taken off, the public would enjoy the entire benefit of the repeal.

Mr. *Wilks* suggested, if the present tax, yielding 800,000*l.*, could not be given up, that a tax of 1*s.* a chaldron should be levied at the pit's mouth which would yield 700,000*l.* and would be much less injurious and partial than the present tax.

Petition to be printed.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, Dec. 9.

MINUTES.] The Consolidated Fund Bill was read a third time and passed.

Petitions presented. By Lord TEYNHAM, two from the Roman Catholic Inhabitants of Parishes in Mayo, praying for a better appropriation of the Parliamentary Grants voted for the Education of the people of Ireland; and from the Merchants, Tradesmen, and others, of the Counties of Middlesex and Surrey, for a parliamentary vote of waste Lands, in order to better the condition of the Poor.—By the Earl of WINCHILSEA, from Cranbrook and Staplehurst, Kent, complaining of Distress, and praying for Parliamentary Reform. For the abolition of Negro Slavery, by the Earl of ROSEBERRY, from Cumnock and Linlithgow:—By the Marquis of BUTE, from Dissenters at Cardiff and Great Yarmouth.

STATE OF THE COUNTRY.—LORD WYNFORD'S MOTION.] Lord *Wynford* said, that in rising to bring forward the Motion of which he had given notice, he felt that this was no ordinary occasion upon which he was about to address their Lordships, and he was afraid, in order to do justice to his subject, that he must trespass on their patience for a longer period than was his general custom. He trusted, however, that he should be able to present to their Lordships such a case, that it would be impossible for them, consistently with the duty which they owed to the country, to refuse the application which he should have the honour to make. He did not at all distrust the merits of the very strong case which he thought he should make out, and he was only afraid, lest, in attempting to do a great deal of good, he should do some evil, by adding to the excitement which unhappily prevailed, to a great extent, throughout the country. He felt a confident hope, however, that nothing which should fall from him would be at all calculated to continue that excitement; on the contrary, he had every expectation, that when the people of this country should come to know, as he hoped the decision of that night would convince them, that their Lordships were determined to do their duty—that they were determined to sift to the bottom the causes of the distress which prevailed in the country, and to exercise their best endeavours to apply a remedy to that distress,—he was satisfied that when the people of this country came to see that, they would, with their well-known good sense, rely as they ought, upon the wisdom and justice of Parliament; and he was equally satisfied that such a decision on the part of their Lordships would have a material effect in preventing those disturbances which now disgraced the country. He must be allowed to state, though he felt persuaded that a great deal of the disorder which prevailed in the country was the consequence of that distress, which, if it could not be called universal, was at all events as nearly so as possible, affecting as it did almost all classes and descriptions of persons, and grinding to the dust those persons particularly who were now the objects of their Lordships' attention,—though such was his persuasion, he must be allowed to state that he did not think the fires which had occurred in different parts of the country were to be attributed to that cause. When the English people were distressed, they were apt, it was true, to commit disorders against the law, but Englishmen in distress never wickedly malignantly and absurdly destroyed their neighbour's property, as had been lately done in various parts of this country. He was thoroughly persuaded that such disgraceful transactions were of an exotic origin, and, though some Englishmen might be employed as agents by those persons who were desirous to promote disturbance, confusion, and perhaps rebellion in the country, they were led on by persons who were inimical, instead of being friendly, to the promotion of their real and best interests. Could any man doubt, he would ask, that distress prevailed in the country, and that to a very great extent? He would only entreat any one who entertained such a doubt, to take a journey for fifty miles on any side of London, and he would see the people out of employment, and the troops engaged in the expensive and laborious occupation of repressing disturbances. If the countenances of the people should not satisfy such a person as to the existence and extent of that distress which he was about to shew their Lordships was mainly attributable to the imperfect state of the English law, let him but go into the parish vestry, and there he would see the difficulty encountered in providing support for the poor, and he would behold the sudden transformation which, in innumerable cases, had lately taken place, of rate-payers into rate-receivers. If that circumstance was not sufficient to satisfy such a person as to the existence of the distress, let him only consider the immense increase of crime which had taken place, and which was the necessary consequence of that distress. The Judges of the land were often called upon to punish offences, the commission of which the wisdom of Parliament should have prevented. No man could look at the Gaol-calendar and not see that a frightful increase of crime had taken place within the last few years, which could be attributed to no other cause than the increased distress of the inhabitants of this country. He would refer their Lordships to a document which would put that matter beyond dispute, and which ought to satisfy every one of them, that unless they afforded relief, they could not arrest the progress of crime amongst the whole of the labouring population of this country. The document to which he alluded was "An Account of the Persons who had been sent out to New South Wales;" and from it their Lordships would perceive that the number had lately increased very much. In the year 1825 there were 233 persons transported to Botany Bay from Great Britain and Ireland; in the year 1826 their Lordships would be surprised to find that number increased to 1,815; in the year 1827 it was still further increased, to the enormous amount of 2,587 persons; and in 1828 there was a trifling reduction in the number, leaving it, however, at 2,449. It appeared to him impossible to present to their Lordships a stronger proof that crimes were numerous, and that distress from which alone they could arise, existed to the extent he had stated amongst the lower orders of the people of this country. If he stopped here, he might be told by the noble Earl opposite, for whom he had a great respect, and to whose judgment he should defer, if he had not thought much himself on this subject, that all this might be inquired into by the Committee which their Lordships had already appointed to examine into the state of the Poor-laws, and that before such a Committee they might also enter into an inquiry as to the state and condition of the poor. That certainly was not his opinion, and he thought if their Lordships should limit their inquiries to that committee, that they would do little or nothing. His object was, not to inquire into the best mode of managing the poor, but to provide for the general relief of the people of this country. It was to inquire into the best mode of managing the funds for the poor that the Committee alluded to had been appointed, and to that object was its inquiry limited. But where would be the use of making inquiries about the funds for the poor, if there were none? He wished to shew what had been the occasion of the diminution of those funds, which were now as their Lordships would see, completely inadequate to provide a maintenance for the poor. What was wanted was funds for the support of the poor: if they were not provided, the poor could not be relieved, and he did not understand that the committee already appointed was empowered to extend its inquiries so far. He could not refer to a higher authority, to shew that something more was requisite than an inquiry into the Poor-laws, than the sentiments delivered by Sir Robert Peel, in another place, and which were echoed by the late Mr. Huskisson on the same occasion. Sir Robert Peel said last Session, and Mr. Huskisson expressed himself to the same effect, confirming the language which had been previously held by the noble Duke (Wellington), that there was no want of capital in this country, but that it was in an unhealthy state; that it was collected into the hands of a few; was shut up in strong boxes, and did not find its way into the possession of the productive classes. Though the currency of the country now exceeded, as the noble Duke had stated, and as he believed, the limits of the currency in any former period of our history, yet another hon. Gentleman, Mr. Alderman Thompson, on the occasion to which he had alluded, stated, that it was not sufficient for the wants of the country; and he derived his proof from the fact, that tradesmen were obliged now in many instances to pay their labourers in goods instead of money. He would take that declaration, and the opinions expressed by the two distinguished individuals to whom he had referred, as sufficient grounds for his proposition that inquiry was necessary into other branches of our social economy, than the operation of the Poor-laws. Whether this state of things was owing to the changes which had been made in our currency, or to a want of confidence, arising from any other cause, he did not then give any opinion; but admitting that there was no deficiency of capital, if it was not properly employed, and if those who possessed it were unwilling to lend it out for the promotion of the productive industry and manufactures of the country, in what state must the country be? If the country had been so unfortunate in all its speculations, agricultural and commercial, that the capitalists were induced to stop the life-blood of the country by locking up their wealth instead of sending it forth to support the industry of the country, was it not time to inquire into the causes of such a lamentable state of things? If such were the fact, and if distress existed to an immense extent throughout the country, was it not the bounden duty of their Lordships to institute an inquiry with a view to ascertain the causes of that distress, so that they might be enabled to apply a remedy? In bringing forward this Motion, he did not wish to express a want of confidence in his Majesty's Ministers. It was out of the power of the present Ministry, as it was out of the power of the Ministry that preceded them, to remedy that deficient state of the law which had been so productive of the distress. It was not irregular for him, perhaps, to advert to what had occurred the other day in the Committee up-stairs, where it had been stated that the funds of the farmer were nearly exhausted, and that he had no means of paying his labourers; that if he had the means to pay them, he had abundant work for them; but that he had actually not the capital to enable him to do so. Such was the state of the country, as he would undertake to prove at their Lordships' bar—a mode of investigation he should much prefer, though he should be content with any mode of inquiry they should grant. He would much rather, however, that there should be a public inquiry at their bar, so that the public should be enlightened as to the conduct of two great and respectable classes of individuals who had been so scandalously calumniated in this country,—he meant the landlords and farmers. He wished for such a public opportunity to vindicate them against the foul charges which had been preferred against them. He should be content, however, with any inquiry which it would please their Lordships to grant, so as it enabled them to get at the causes of the distress. A great variety of causes had been assigned for the prevailing distress. It was not necessary for him to give a decided opinion as to the causes, as his only object was, to prove the existence of distress, and point out the necessity which there was for inquiry. It had been lately said, that there were dawnings of improvement in the manufacturing districts of this country. God grant that it was so! but he, for one, did not anticipate that such an improvement, if it existed, was likely to be a lasting one. He thought that it might, perhaps, be attributed to the late troubles on the Continent, and perhaps it would cease the moment the Continent returned to its old habits of industry. Perhaps, too, the increased activity was caused by speculation, anticipating a large demand in consequence of the interruption to industry in some parts of the Continent; but if the case should turn out so, the temporary prosperity would be soon followed by a greater degree of adversity. A noble Lord, now no more, (Lord Liverpool) had attributed the distress which existed in his time, but which now prevailed to a much greater extent, to excessive production. That could not now be the case, for no one could doubt that the produce of the land had diminished to a frightful extent, and it was to be apprehended that it would diminish still further. If it went on diminishing, the time would come when England would be dependent upon foreign countries for her supply of corn; and therefore, in bad seasons, when the crops on the Continent might be short, as well as the crops in this country, all the evils of scarcity would be immeasurably increased. With regard to manufactures, there was an excessive glut of manufactures, which might be accounted for by the use of machinery. He begged to say, that he was no enemy to machinery, if the employment of it were properly regulated; but when it produced a glut in the market, it injured the manufacturer, and it injured the poor man, by depriving him of the means of obtaining employment for his labour. He was of opinion that the poor man had as good a right to have his labour protected, as the manufacturer had to have his manufactures protected, so as to enable him to carry on his trade. He would suggest that that was a fit subject for inquiry, in order to regulate the employment of machinery. He was not so absurd as to propose to put a stop to the use of machinery altogether, but its use should be properly regulated, so as not to interfere with the labour of the poor man. He wished that justice should be dealt out to all, without distinction; and if any distinction were made, it should be made in favour of the poor man. Another cause of the distress was said to be the diminution of the precious metals. Whether or not that was the case, he could not say; but if it were, great as the horror which he, in common with every one acquainted with the history of the country, must feel at an alteration of the currency, he was of opinion, if a great deficiency in the precious metals were proved to exist, that there should be an alteration of the currency. If there was a great diminution in the currency in this and other countries, that might partly account for the distress, but that was a point which was doubted; by many the fact was denied, and, therefore, it was a proper subject for inquiry. Probably the evil might be removed, if it existed, by altering the regulations of our coinage. Their Lordships should recollect that there was a seignorage charged of, he believed, eight per cent in other countries; and it might be a part of the inquiry whether a seignorage should not be charged on our gold coin. Their Lordships had lately made an alteration in the currency, which certainly did not form the standard, but which formed a great portion of the currency of the country. A pound of silver, which was formerly cut into sixty-two shillings, was now cut into sixty-six, which made a difference of almost five per cent, and was a seignorage on the silver to that amount. He was not prepared to say that a seignorage to that amount should be charged on our gold coin, but many enlightened men entertained that opinion, affirming, that such an alteration would relieve distress, and he did not know why such a principle should not be soberly and solemnly investigated. The next opinion to which he would refer was, that the distress of the country was owing to the restriction upon the issuing of small notes. He trusted that, from what he had heard said by the noble Earl opposite on that point last Session, he should have his support. He would contend, that the issuing of the 1*l.* and 2*l.* notes would not be such an alteration of the currency as would have the effect of altering contracts. If they were issued to the greatest extent, the currency would remain the same as to contracts, for they would still be fulfilled by the same standard. The only effect of the issuing of the small notes would be, to give the country-bankers and the Bank of England the means of accommodating those who wanted accommodation. The noble Duke (Wellington) had asked last Session—"Would you give the country-bankers the unlimited power of coining?" Certainly not—he would not allow them to issue notes, unless they deposited Exchequer-bills to the extent of their issues. If the 1*l.* notes were not issued, the country-bankers could not lend to the farmer, and the capital of the country would remain, as Sir Robert Peel had stated, locked up in the strong box of the usurer, without being productive of any benefit to the industry of the country. But such a measure, it was said, would be a departure from the ancient policy of the country: it would be no such thing. It was not until the 5th of Geo. 3rd, that the people were restricted from issuing small notes; and previous to that, promissory notes, of no greater value than a shilling were issued. Such notes, however, were productive of frauds. It was on the principle of preventing fraud, then, and not on the principle that it was dangerous to the circulating medium, or a trespass on the King's prerogative, that a bill was brought in by Sir George Saville,—the 15th of Geo. 3rd,—to put a stop to that circulation. The 17th of Geo. 3rd proceeded precisely on the same principle as the 15th, putting an end to the circulation of the 5*l.* notes—not on the principle of preventing an excessive issue of notes, but to prevent fraud, and to protect the poor from being plundered. The most favourite doctrine of political economy was, that every man should be left to take care of himself; but here they would not trust a man to manage his own affairs and business, and they would not allow one person to issue, and another to take, a small note. That was quite inconsistent with the doctrine of the political economists, and would not be right unless the whole science was founded in error. The next cause assigned for the distress was excessive taxation. He should be the last man to wish to interfere with the just rights of the public creditor; at the same time he must state, that distress in this country was greatly aggravated, if not caused, by excessive taxation. It was admitted by Mr. Pitt, that the taxes, direct and indirect, took two-fifths of his earnings out of the pockets of the poor man. They heard a great deal about high rents, but would any man say, that they took two-fifths, or even one-fifth, from the wages of the labourer? They certainly did not take one-tenth out of his pockets when his bread came to be eaten. He mentioned this, not to put down the taxes, but to remove an unjust odium which was attempted to be cast on the landed interest. They were told, that if they reduced their rents to what they were in 1793, every thing would be right, and that the country would go on well, and that all our affairs would be in a most flourishing state. He would undertake, however, to prove that, with regard to rent, except in cities and towns, where circumstances might have occasioned a great rise in some rents,—he would undertake, he repeated, to prove, that in the country parts the landed proprietors only received a fair interest for the improvements they had made; and that, making that allowance, the rents had been reduced to the standard of 1793, and in many instances even below it. He had taken pains to inquire into this subject, and he pledged himself to the fact. He would go further, and offer to prove, that even those rents could not be recovered unless some alteration was made in the existing law; and still further, that in the case of lands of the second and third class no rent whatever could be obtained. It might be said, that the land which had fallen out of cultivation was not worth reclaiming, and that it would be better to employ capital in some other way. Unfortunately, that doctrine was supported by a great and most powerful instrument in this country—the public press; and were it generally credited and acted upon, would be ruinous to the country. If the poor land was to be thrown out of cultivation, millions would be deprived of subsistence. To any one who attended to the state of the country, it was plain that it was not the rate of wages which was complained of, for they were as high as ever, but it was the want of employment, and that employment the farmers had not the means to give. It was not those who were employed that complained, but those who were suffering from the want of that employment which the farmers were unable to give them. The throwing up the poor land, which required more labour than rich land, was one cause of the want of employment, and of the distress; and the object of their Lordships ought to be, if possible, so to relieve the farmer, that he might advantageously cultivate the poor land. He would beg of their Lordships also to recollect what had taken place since 1793. Since that time settlements had been made, and money had been borrowed upon estates, in a very different standard from what then prevailed. How were these incumbrances to be discharged, if a return was made to the standard of 1793? Besides, if such a deduction were to take place, would the landed proprietor be in the same state as the rest of the community? Certainly not; for, with the rents of 1793, he could not afford to give those prices which articles fetched in 1830. The necessaries and the luxuries of life had been, some of them, doubled, some of them trebled, in price, since 1793. Unless, therefore, every thing else were reduced in the same proportion with rents, the consequence of returning to rents of 1793 would be, that the landed gentlemen would be degraded from their station. Nor would this be the only consequence—the landed gentlemen would not be the only persons who would suffer by such a reduction; all who were dependent on them,—servants, labourers, and small shopkeepers, all these would suffer in the same proportion with those by whom they were supported. He should presently show also, that if this principle were acted upon, the manufacturing and commercial interests of the country must, and would, fall with the agricultural interests. Their Lordships would recollect, that in dealing with this subject, allusion had very frequently been made to bad seasons. These were stated to have been great causes of distress; and there could be no doubt that such calamities must have had their effect. They were told last year that the badness of the season was the great cause of the evil then complained of; but now they had had a good season, and yet the evil not only remained, but it had increased. This circumstance shewed, he thought, that the causes of our distress were not yet accurately known, and were worthy of the consideration of their Lordships. The next circumstance put forward to account for the evil was, the state of the Corn-laws. It had been constantly asserted, that the Corn-laws were, in fact, the great, and almost the only cause of the evil. If this were so, let the Corn-laws be repealed. He had no objection himself to the repeal of the Corn-laws; his interest in them was but small; and though he was certainly the friend of the landed interest, yet he was no further the friend of it than because he was convinced that every thing which affected the landed interest must affect at the same time all the other interests of the country. He saw no objection to the Corn-laws being repealed, if, at the same time, their Lordships took away those burthens which weighed peculiarly on the landed interest. He was quite sure that the Corn-laws of 1826 were of no use to the agricultural interest. They might be, and he believed they were, useful to the speculator: they might, and he believed they did, encourage a spirit of gambling, which had originated on the Stock Exchange, but which now affected all our markets, which deranged the whole economy of our domestic life, and which caused uncertainty in every species of property throughout the country. The part of the Corn-laws to which he more particularly alluded was that which regulated importation; but, among the objections to the Corn-laws,—and those objections were as serious as they were numerous,—none appeared to him to be so strong as the objection to the mode of striking the averages. These averages were regulated by the price of British corn, and, while Irish corn was to be considered as British corn, he must say, that he thought it very hard that the price of Irish corn was not included in the averages. While he was upon this subject, allow him to observe, that he thought our neighbours—he meant the French—were, in some things, wiser than we were. In France there was a distinction made between corn carried in French vessels, and corn carried in vessels of any other country. We made no such distinction; and he was very much afraid that foreigners went back with their ballast and their money for their corn, and took none of our manufactures in return. And this led him to speak of those burthens which were exclusively borne by the agricultural interest. Of these burthens it would not be too much to say, that they amounted to 25 per cent at the very least; and yet the agricultural interest had no equivalent protection given them in return—that was to say, no protection which gave them any remuneration. Thus, for instance, the Poor-laws attached almost exclusively to the land. At the period of the enactment of the Poor-laws—the time of Elizabeth—very little commercial wealth could be touched by these laws,—very little was in existence; but all the land was reached by them. They reached also the inhabitants of towns, it was true; but only their visible, not their actual, means were affected by the Statute of that queen. The same was the case now, and at the present time the landed interest paid more than three-fourths of the poor-rates: the landed interest paid this, and paid it, too, for the support, not of its own poor only, but of the manufacturing poor also. He should show their Lordships that this was the fact. A man might have a factory in a certain parish, and carry on business with an additional capital of 100,000*l.*, and such a man would be rated, not according to all his property, including his capital, but merely according to the value of the building. Now, this was obviously an unfair assessment. Besides, such a man, though he would have his factory in one place, might have his workmen in all the parishes around; who, when turned off, must be supported by the parishes to which they belonged. If this were examined into, he was convinced it would appear, that a very large proportion of the poor-rates were thus paid by the landed interest. He next came to the land-tax. That tax was originally intended to apply to all property; but, as it had turned out, all property, with the exception of certain pensions, escaped, and the land paid the whole of the tax. When this tax was first laid on, a bounty was given on the exportation of corn, to landed proprietors, in order to induce them to consent to the tax; but that bounty had been taken away, and the tax remained. These were some of the burthens which weighed heavily and unfairly upon the landed interest. He could mention others, if he were not afraid of detaining their Lordships too long, and he had no doubt that in these burthens their Lordships would, upon inquiry, find the cause of the flourishing condition of the large towns, while the landed interest decayed. Their Lordships would find, that no foreign manufactured produce was admitted into this country without paying very high duties, while foreign raw produce, that came into competition with the growth of our own soil was admitted, at almost a nominal duty. But why, he would ask, should it be thought necessary to neglect one interest while they protected another? The profession which he had followed, and the high station which he had had the honour to fill, taught him the principle of perfectly equal justice, and that principle demanded that those burthens which it was necessary to impose upon the community should be equally borne by all its various parts. He was sorry to have detained their Lordships so long; but there was yet one topic upon which he felt it necessary to touch. He need not tell their Lordships how loud the complaints of distress were, nor was it necessary for him to inquire into the truth of the assertion, that the distress complained of was generally felt. He believed, however, that that assertion was true. Let their Lordships agree to his motion, and inquire into the fact, if they had any doubts upon the subject; but he was convinced that the manufacturing and commercial interests sympathized with the landed interest. Indeed, this was the necessary consequence of the distress which was universally admitted to prevail in the landed interest. It was quite as impossible that the landed interest could suffer, and the other interests of the country flourish, as that a man who was struck with the palsy in three parts of his body could be healthy in the other part. If their Lordships would look into Mr. Colquhoun's book, they would see this ably demonstrated. There was, however, one criterion even safer than that of Mr. Colquhoun's authority—he meant the proof afforded by the income-tax; from a view of the returns under that tax, their Lordships might judge of the different importance of the agricultural and the manufacturing interests. In the year 1815, the last in which that tax was levied, it would be found that the income-tax, levied on a rate of ten per cent, produced for the land 8,200,000*l.*; and, deducting two millions for houses, that left six millions as the contribution of the land alone. If they looked, then, at the returns of the same tax upon commerce and manufactures, what would be the result? Commerce, manufactures, professions, and trades, together with property abroad, which paid a tax in this country, produced but three millions. Take from that sum one million for property abroad, that paid a tax here, and that left two millions as the whole of the income-tax upon commerce, manufactures, trades, and professions; while the land alone paid six millions. Could it be denied, after that fact, that the landed interest was the most important in the country? And if so, was it not likely, as he had asserted, that the depression of that interest in the home market must depress all the rest, and must produce all those evils of which so many complaints were now heard? He might add, with regard to the calculation he had just made, that he believed it would be found that three-fourths of the money paid on behalf of the towns was produced from the owner of the land and his tenants, and from those who were concerned in the home trade of the country. He did not undervalue the foreign trade, but he did not think that, in order to preserve it, we should sacrifice our internal means of prosperity. If we fostered and encouraged our home trade, and, above all, our agriculture, we should be happy and independent. If the foreign trade left us, as there was good reason to believe it would, still we should find ample means for the development of our industry in the home market, and in our commerce with our colonies. Our merchants, who fetched for our use the produce of the earth from the most distant of its extremities, and whose skill and perseverance had enabled them to convert what at first appeared a barrier into a more easy means of universal communication, would still be able to keep us, in any case of necessity, above the possibility of a deficient supply, so that it was impossible a country like this could ever feel itself dependent on any other for a supply of corn. He repeated, therefore, that, to preserve our foreign trade, we ought not to sacrifice our agriculture and our home trade, on the success of which depended much of the moral courage and energy of the people of this country. We saw already symptoms of the decline of our foreign commerce, and we ought to provide ourselves with a substitute in the additional encouragement given to our agriculture. Our commerce was declining, because other countries had become, like us, manufacturers. France had her manufactures; America had hers, and to that extent, too, that they had occasioned a great falling off in our exports. The Russians and Germans, also, had their manufactures. Those people were so stupid as not to attend to the wise opinions of our political economists, who told them to take our manufactures, —they refused to do so—they manufactured their own goods. The Danes did the same. He had seen a very clever Essay —no doubt very clever—in which the Danes were told not to manufacture their own cloth, because they could get it so much cheaper here; but they said, " If I buy from you I must pay money for it, but if I buy it at home I may appear to pay a little dearer for it, but I can make that payment in paper." In his opinion, we ought to follow the same course, and give the same answer to the advice of those political economists who recommend us to buy the agricultural produce of other countries, and to continue to pay in gold; for, whilst we paid in money, we diminished our means of competition, and threw out of employ the workmen by whose labour we were supported. He would just call the attention of the House to the history of the years 1815, 1816, 1817, 1818, and 1820, in confirmation of what he had just stated. If they read the history of those years, they would see that our manufacturing interests were, as they always must be, affected by the prosperity or decline of our agriculture. When the latter flourished, the former were prosperous; when the latter declined, the former felt the consequences of the pressure. In 1815, corn, from the monopoly of agriculture existing during the war, in consequence of which our lands were well cultivated, was very cheap; and though he admitted that manufactures were then suddenly depressed, he knew that that depression was occasioned by other circumstances. In 1816 the quantity of corn in the country was exhausted, and the agricultural interests were distressed. In the same manner the manufactures were affected. In 1817 the corn got up in price; no supply was obtained from abroad, and corn was at 105*s.* per quarter; yet, in spite of that, and because the agricultural interest was flourishing, manufactures were in a prosperous condition, and the Prince Regent, in the opening Speech of the Session, congratulated Parliament on the flourishing state of the country. In 1818 both the agricultural and the commercial interests were prosperous, but in 1820 corn fell lower than it had ever before been known, and manufactures at the same time suffered an exactly similar depression. At that time his Majesty, in his Speech from the Throne, expressed his sorrow at the unfortunate state of the country. He now begged to remind the noble Earl, at present at the head of his Majesty's Government, that when the Address in answer to the Speech was moved, that noble Earl desired that some expressions of a stronger nature than those inserted in the Address should be employed, for he asserted that those expressions, strong as they were, were not strong enough to express the feelings of that House on the subject of the distress of the country. He was satisfied that it was quite impossible to find a stronger instance than that he had just alluded to of the fact, that when the agricultural interest was depressed, the manufactures inevitably suffered along with it. He wished now to mention another circumstance, not less important than the flourishing or decayed state of the trade of the country—he meant that of the danger of famine if the agriculture of our country should be suffered to go without its full support. That danger had existed when agriculture was in a better state than now. In 1817, if we had had Corn-laws such as those now in force, that evil would have happened, for, instead of corn being 105*s.* a quarter, he believed that a great part of the people would have perished from famine. The same causes which produced a scarcity in England would produce it abroad. We ought not, therefore, to trust to the foreign market, but to encourage our own agriculture generally, so that the deficiencies of one year might be supplied by the abundance of another. He was sure, that unless care was taken to accomplish this object, some dreadful famine would fall on the country, and the fault would be on their Lordships' heads if that occurrence was not fully provided against. In the course of his professional life he had become a little acquainted with the matter of Exchanges, and, from what he had learnt, he was of opinion, and he believed others agreed with him, that the exchanges of the country ought to be kept as uniform as possible; at least, that they ought not to be allowed to go against us. That which he regarded as an evil—the exchanges being against us—was a matter always determined by the importation or non-importation of corn. During two of the years which he had before referred to, when corn had been imported, the exchanges were against us, in one instance, to as great an amount as 6 per cent; when the importation ceased, the exchanges rose, and in a very short time were actually in our favour. In his opinion, protection ought equally to be given to every species of labour; and he was quite sure, that in any measure that would have that tendency the people would find as great a blessing as the Legislature could bestow. The same cause which depressed the agricultural interest deprived a part of the industry of the country of that protection which it deserved. The agricultural produce of this country was, in consequence, not equal now to what it had been in some former years. In what he had already stated he had not mentioned all the causes of the present distress, but all those things which were usually described as the causes of it. He asked their Lordships to examine all these, to see whether they were all, or whether there were others, that contributed to produce the distress, and whether that distress was what it was described to be. He should rejoice if it turned out that the distress which was stated to exist did not really exist, for such a circumstance would be the best answer to those people who availed themselves of the distresses of the country to commit the excesses of which they had lately heard so much. He would not diminish the security of the fund-holder; he would not deny that person's just demands upon the State; but he was persuaded that if things went on as they did, though the fund-holder might now have his full dividend, the security of his property would be worth nothing. He would not appeal to their Lordships on the score of interest—that would be the last motive which would influence their conduct; their only motive was, to exert themselves in the best manner possible for the good of the country for the protection of others, not of themselves. Their Lordships held their high situation to protect the interests of the poor, who could not protect themselves; for their sakes he implored the House to adopt some course of inquiry, in order to discover some means of remedy for present evils. If a course better than that he now pointed out could be shown, he was not so bigotted to his own opinions, nor so prejudiced against those of other people, as to refuse to yield his own to a better plan. All he wanted was some effort to relieve the country from its present distresses. For that he appealed to their Lordships—for that he appealed to his Majesty's Ministers; and he could not make that appeal in language so eloquent, nor in any so likely to affect them, as that which had been used by one of themselves. Sir James Graham, in a most excellent pamphlet lately published, had used these striking expressions, addressed to another Government, indeed, but equally as applicable to the present Government as to any other. The noble Lord then read the following extract:—

> "Let me entreat them to depart from their usual course of awaiting the event: a great and an immediate effort is necessary to burst the cord now drawn so tight around them;—if they hesitate, they will be entangled in such complicated difficulties, that resistance and escape will soon be alike impossible."

His Lordship would not further weary the patience of their Lordships, which he had already tried at so great length, but returning them his thanks for the attention they had vouchsafed to shew him, would at once submit the Motion of which he had given notice—"That a Committee should be appointed instantly to inquire into the causes of the present state of the Distress in the Country, and, as far as might be, into the nature of the remedies to be adopted."

The Earl of *Rosebery*, having been a warm supporter of a Motion made by a noble Duke (Richmond) on a subject somewhat analogous to this, although between the two there was certainly a broad line of distinction, and although the noble Baron opposite had not stated whether he moved for a Select Committee, or for a Committee of the whole House, [Lord Wynford signified that he left that to their Lordships]; but putting that difference out of the question, having been in the course of the last Session a warm supporter of a Motion of this sort, he felt bound now to state why he dissented from the present Motion; and, in doing so, he should declare that he was not conscious of any inconsistency in conduct or opinion, for he asserted then, as he believed now, that the strictest inquiry should be made into the causes of these periodical returns of national distress. The first reason on which he objected to the present Motion was, that a few days ago a Committee on the Poor-laws had been appointed; and thinking, as he did, that the mal-administration of those laws was a principal grievance of the people, and therefore one of the causes of the present distress, by bringing a redundancy of population into the market, to compete for employment, and by causing a constant interference with labour, breaking the spirit of the labourer and destroying all his feelings of independence, inducing him no longer to trust to himself and his own industry—thinking this, he could not but feel satisfied, that if that Committee did its duty, and the Government did their duty (of which he had no doubt), by co-operating with the Committee, the evils now in existence would progressively, and he trusted not with a slow pace, be removed. It must be a subject of great grief to their Lordships that the state of the labouring classes was, in this as in many other countries, deteriorated within the last few years; and what was of more importance, the depression of these classes was co-existent with the elevation of their minds by the diffusion of knowledge, and by the vast strides which education and the power of reading had made within the same time. He therefore thought, that the time was come when every man who had a heart to feel, or an understanding to comprehend this state of things, must be filled with the deepest anxiety to discover the cause of the present evils, and to apply a proper remedy. The first objection he made to the present Motion was, that the necessity of it was in a manner superseded by the committee having been appointed to which he had already alluded. The second objection which he had to this Motion arose from the recent change made in the Government, and from the circumstances which had led to that change, and from the pledges which his Majesty's Ministers had made to the Parliament and to the country. The noble Earl now at the head of the Government had, immediately upon his taking Office,—on the very first night of his appearing there in his present station, not only agreed to a Motion made by the noble Marquis for a Committee on the state of the Poor-laws, but he made a most solemn declaration, that he and his colleagues would take the whole state of the country into their most serious, unceasing, and deliberate consideration; that they would use their utmost efforts to relieve the country, as far as retrenchment could effect its relief, and, as far as their power went, would do their utmost to restore present confidence, and to lay the best foundation for the future prosperity of the country by Reform in Parliament, and in every other department of the State. Under these circumstances, he asked whether it was fair and courteous to persons who had so recently been called to fill their situations to interfere in this manner, not only with the duties they were called on to discharge, but with those which they had expressed themselves willing and ready to enter upon? Such an interference consumed time and disturbed their labours by compelling them to attend a Committee, when they had as good, if not better, means of examination in their hands, and when they might, in a few weeks, state their own plans to the House. It appeared to him that such a course, so far from accelerating that relief, which every man desired to see given, would be destroying much of the good that might be derived from the Committee already appointed. The noble Lord had stated, that not merely the state of the law with reference to the poor ought to be considered, but that the distress was so general and prevalent as to demand immediate attention, and required immediate relief. He agreed with the noble Baron, that the present administration of the Poor-laws was an evil of itself, and the cause of many others—that the present distress was very extensive and dreadful, and that these matters ought to be the subject of a parliamentary inquiry. He should be sorry, either by what he said, or by the vote he should give, to stifle a parliamentary inquiry; but he thought it would be better for them to wait, since he believed it was in the power of Ministers to submit a more effectual measure than could now be submitted by any noble Lord in particular. He only wished that the inquiry should be postponed, not altogether rejected. It was not his intention to trespass longer on the attention of their Lordships, if the noble Lord would withdraw his Motion; but as he found that was not likely, he should take the liberty of saying a few words on some topics introduced by that noble Lord. The noble Lord seemed to imagine, that the right hon. Gentleman now no more, had asserted that the capital of this country was locked up in strong boxes, or lent out to usury. Although he did not mean to enter into the circumstances of the distress of the country, he had no hesitation in repeating what he had stated last Session, that one of the causes that contributed to the distress had been the unnatural or improper, and inconvenient distribution of the capital of the country; but it would require more than the imagination of the right hon. individual alluded to, to suppose that any part of the capital of the country was hoarded in strong boxes. It was an idea impossible to be believed, and certainly one which that right hon. Gentleman had never entertained. The noble Lord had gone at length into the subject of rents, and had stated that rents throughout the kingdom had materially lowered since the Peace; and he had been understood to say, that if rents were more lowered, the distress that might ensue to the landlords, especially those on whom the encumbrances of an antecedent period were still charged, would be such as they could not bear. His belief was, that rents had been considerably lowered, but he would not go the length of saying, that they had been universally lowered to that level which the price of produce and the expense of farming made necessary, and he did not agree in the inference that the distress of the landlords was such as they could not bear, for if the farmer was unable to pay the present rents, they must be reduced to the price of produce. At the same time he must be allowed to say, that in his judgment the distress among the agricultural population did not arise from the high state of the rents. He believed there might be some particular instances in which distress arose from that cause, but he believed also, that distress was greatest where low wages existed from the competition of the labourers, arising from the excess in the number of labourers above the demand for them—an excess which was mainly attributable to the maladministration of the Poor-laws. In reference to the general internal state of the country, and, perhaps, more particularly with respect to the observations of the noble Lord with regard to the increase of crime, he could not close the few observations he had to make without adverting to the state of the Game-laws. He was convinced that the Game-laws of England demoralised the people, while no good was obtained from their continuance. They had had and they now had a great tendency to produce ill will and enmity where formerly there existed respect; and they led, moreover, to habits of violence, to a roving and predatory character, and caused a disposition to tumult, to which some of the scenes recently acted in different parts of the country might be attributed. He was sorry to say, that their Lordships were responsible for this state of the law, for more than once a bill had been brought from the other House with a view to place the Game-laws on an uniform, rational, and sound principle; but these bills had always been thrown out or injuriously modified, by their Lordships. As he saw by the votes of the other House that a bill on this subject had lately been introduced with enactments similar to those which had formerly passed that House, he trusted, that this Session would not pass away without a total alteration of those laws—an alteration from which he anticipated the most beneficial results to the peace, the happiness, and the tranquillity of the people. He should transgress the rule he had laid down if he did more than state, that he opposed this Motion because a committee on the most important part of it was now sitting. He felt the greatest confidence in the rectitude of the feelings of the noble Lord now at the head of the Government. He believed that the Ministers would co-operate with the Parliament, and do not only as much as Parliament required, but more; and would lend their utmost ability, and all their faculties, to ascertain the causes of the distress—a matter more easy than to discover a remedy. He believed that they would do their utmost to discover and apply a remedy to existing evils; and if the noble Lord would withdraw his Motion its object might be better accomplished by the Committee already granted.

The Earl of *Eldon* said, that their Lordships would perhaps be surprised to hear that, timid as he generally was in coming to a decision, he was now fully and deeply impressed with a sense of the necessity that existed for a parliamentary inquiry into the causes of the distress which pervaded the country. Whether he was right or wrong in the conviction which he entertained, he would not pretend to say; but having such a conviction as he had, he felt compelled to give his consent to the Motion of his noble and learned friend for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the causes of the present lamentable condition of the country. Some two or three years ago several different causes were assigned for the nature of the distress which then prevailed. The first was stated, in no less important a document than a King's Speech, to be the nature of the season, over which it was alleged that the Government had no control—a truth as obvious as any that was ever uttered either in that House or any where else. Their Lordships were also informed, in the same document that other causes were in existence; but they were neither told what those causes were, nor permitted to inquire into their extent and magnitude. His noble and learned friend had stated in his speech various causes for the present distress. He was sorry to say, that he differed from his noble and learned friend as to the capability of many of those causes to produce the results which he attributed to them; but in any assembly less dignified than that of their Lordships, the difference of opinion between himself and his noble and learned friend, would be considered as a reason, not for prohibiting, but for promoting inquiry. With respect to what had been said on the subject of machinery, he would only observe that he could not agree either with those who called upon the Government to alter the state of the law regarding machinery, or with those who recommended them to put an end to the employment of it. Let their Lordships consider for moment what would be the consequence of following such impolitic advice. Till machinery was invented, arms and hands were the implements with which men worked. Arms and hands were found, however, unable to compete with machinery, and machinery was in consequence employed, not only in our own country, but also in foreign nations. Now, if we were to put an end to the employment of it, and to return to the labour of arms and hands alone, the consequence would be, that the arms and hands of foreign nations, supported also by foreign machinery, would supply our markets with goods, and reduce our labourers to a worse condition even than that in which they were involved at present. He hoped that it would not be supposed that in supporting the present Motion, he was either casting a censure upon the late, or expressing distrust of the present, Administration. He was doing neither: he was only expressing his conviction that the state of the country demanded parliamentary inquiry, and under that conviction he should support the present Motion, which he conceived was rather calculated to assist than embarrass the consultations of the new Administration.

Lord *King* spoke as follows:—The noble and learned Lord,—for learned I must call him, and learned I have no doubt he is in his own profession, but learned he is not in the information which is wanted here, or at least he has thrown no light on the opaque atmosphere which a learned Gentleman below the bar told us pervaded this House,—the noble and learned Lord has moved for a committee to inquire into the causes of the distress which now pervades the country, to devise remedies for it, and to report its opinion thereupon to the House. Taking the view of this question that the noble and learned Lord has taken, I am surprised that he does not see that the committee for which he moves would, if granted to him, be nothing more than a mere *ignis fatuus*,—that it would only involve him and your Lordships in greater obscurity and deeper gloom,—that it would only plunge him further into the mire than he has got already,—and that it could not by any accident be of the slightest advantage, either to himself or to the country. The noble and learned Lord has throughout his speech done all he could to deride political economists and the public Press; but his derision throughout was nothing better than a lamentable joke. The noble and learned Lord says, that we are reduced to our present wretched and calamitous condition, by the doctrines of the political economists, and by the mischievous influence of the public Press. Now, I venture to tell the noble and learned Lord that it is because the doctrines of the political economists have been neglected, and not because they have been too much attended to, that we are in our present state of suffering. The noble and learned Lord, like all the deriders of theorists and political economists, is a little bit of a theorist himself; and as his theory is not a little extraordinary, let us see what it is, and how he defends it. The notion of the noble and learned Lord regarding capital is certainly of a novel description. He says that there is capital in the country, but that it is unfortunately locked up in the strong box. Does the noble and learned Lord know what capital is? Why, houses are capital, land is capital, food is capital raiment is capital. All these, I admit, are locked up in a strong box; but then that strong box is as large as the Island of Great Britain, and in that strong box I hope they will long remain. The noble Lord quoted, I think, part of a speech made by Sir Robert Peel in another place, to justify his opinion upon that point; but he has not acted quite fairly by that speech, for he has given us part of a line out of it, and has omitted the remainder of it. He says, "Sir Robert Peel told the country that its capital was locked up in a strong box," and then he recommends a one-pound note circulation to conjure it from its fastenings. Now, if I recollect that speech of Sir Robert Peel's correctly, he followed up the declaration which the noble and learned Lord just quoted, by putting down that very circulation which the noble and learned Lord recommended. Another part of the noble and learned Lord's political economy is embodied in a complaint, that the Russians, the Danes, and the Americans are all running us hard in the production of manufactures. Does the noble and learned Lord know why they are running us hard? If he does not, I will tell him. The reason is, because we will not take their raw produce in return for our manufactures. The noble and learned Lord says, that the reason of their producing manufactures is, because they pay for their things in paper; but the reason is, that we compel them to use their raw produce themselves, instead of taking it into our warehouses, and returning them manufactured goods in exchange. Does the noble and learned Lord suppose that any thing is given for nothing? Does he suppose that they will give us their raw produce without receiving any thing in return? Their raw produce must be paid for in manufactured goods; we are not permitted to take their raw produce, and therefore they will not take our manufactured produce. That is the mistake into which all the deriders of theory, who are generally the least of practical men and the most of theorists that can be found, are always falling; they never will understand that these countries have nothing but raw produce to exchange for our manufactured produce, and that when we refuse to take their raw produce, we compel them to convert it into a manufactured state themselves. One more sample of the noble and learned Lord's political economy, and I have done with it for a time. The noble and learned Lord talked very largely of the importance of maintaining the exchanges. He says, "If you import corn, down at once go your exchanges, and there is no knowing where they will stop." I admit that when corn is admitted on an emergency arising suddenly, and contrary to general expectation, the exchanges will probably fall; but then I ask the noble and learned Lord to tell me whether, when there is no corn in the country, he would not rather let the exchanges go down than see the country continue without corn? As the noble and learned Lord has given your Lordships a taste of the quality of his political economy, allow me in return to give you some notion of mine. I think that the great distress which now prevails in various parts of the country arises from this: — That the tendency of your legislation for many years back has been, to encourage an over-supply of the population, and an under-supply of food. The over-supply of the population has been supported—indeed I may say has been mainly supported—by that mal-administration of the Poor-laws of which the noble and learned Lord so justly complained. The system of under-paying single men for their labour had an inevitable tendency to make them marry, and was a direct encouragement to make them improvident of the future. I have been told by a clergyman, who has the care of an extensive parish in an agricultural district, that he has often been surprised at the youth of the couple who have come before him to be married. On one occasion, a young lad of nineteen came with a young girl of his own age. My friend the clergyman said to them "You are very young, what has induced you to marry so soon?" The man answered — and my friend tells me that he has frequently received the same answer—"I am not married, and therefore I cannot get, and you will not give me, work—I come here to be married, and then give me work you must." Such a state of things inevitably led to a great increase of population. Then, with this increased population, you have an under-supply of food, owing to the operation of the Corn-laws. Since the year 1815, when those laws were enacted, the supply of corn grown in the country has sensibly diminished. I can prove this point, if necessary, very clearly; but I believe that it is admitted by all who have taken an extensive view of the face of the country, that agriculture is not now in the same flourishing condition in which it was before the Corn-laws were passed;—that the land is now driven hard;—that much of it has gone out of cultivation; and that, therefore, the produce here now is not equal to what it was. Then if you look abroad, you will see the same circumstances occurring there. We know, that in many of the continental States, large tracts of land, formerly cultivated as corn lands, have been turned into grass; and in the committee which sat upon the Wool-trade, we were even told that the continental farmers, instead of growing corn, had now turned their attention to growing wool. Hence the supply of food being contracted, not only in this country, but also on the Continent, must have been greatly diminished since the first passing of the Corn-laws; hence the labouring classes have not had a belly-full since the year 1815, nor will they have until the Corn-laws are repealed. The diminution in the supply of food would have created great distress and inconvenience, even had the population continued the same; but in the fifteen years which have elapsed since the Corn-laws received their monstrous birth, the increase of the population has been at least 2,000,000. Thus, if the quantity of corn grown both here and abroad be less than the quantity grown fifteen years ago, and if the population who have to subsist on that corn contain 2,000,000 of human beings more than it did then, it is quite evident that there must be a less quantity for each individual to consume. Now, food is capital, and therefore if there be a diminution in the supply of food used by the country, there is a corresponding dimunition in the amount of its capital. Hence it follows, that the proportion which ought to exist between the capital and the population of a country is deranged, and that the condition of the population is deteriorated: for it is on the amount of capital compared with the population, that the happiness of the population always depends. Besides, your Lordships ought never to lose sight of this important truth,—that when food becomes dear, it supplies a great encouragement to increase the employment of machinery, for as the increased price of food leads to an increased rate of wages, the capitalist seeks to supply by the use of machinery the labour which costs him so dear. Your Lordships are therefore inflicting a great injury upon the labouring population when you direct your legislation to produce a high price of corn; for you not only destroy their labour, by preventing them from deriving a supply of cheap corn from those countries which would be glad to exchange corn for the produce of their labour, but you also destroy it by calling into existence a large power of machinery which supersedes it. With respect to the insurrection—for insurrection I am sorry to say it is—which has taken place among the agricultural labourers in the southern counties of England, I think that it will be allowed that it proceeds from severe distress. That distress has been taken advantage of by mischievous agents; but that there is distress, and severe distress, no man can doubt. How are you endeavouring to meet that distress? By an advance in the rate of wages. If that advanced rate of wages should continue to be paid,—and I am afraid that it cannot,—it will create a greater demand on the food of the country, and, by doing so, will produce a greater consumption of that capital in which you are most deficient. The question, therefore, comes to this,—will the capital of the country, diminished as it will be by a greater consumption of food, be replaced by any increase in the profits usually derived from it? Certainly not; and if that be so, then the advance in the rate of wages will have a tendency to lower the general rate of profits, and will thus affect the future prospects of the country. I repeat, that I do not believe that this advance in the rate of wages can be long maintained. It is not natural,—it has been brought about by the necessity of the times; it cannot afford the farmer a remuneration, and therefore it is vain to expect that it will be continued. Instead of directing our attention to the temporary change in the condition of part of the labouring classes, we should look for a change which will benefit all the working classes of the country,—for a change which will not be partial and transitory, but which will permanently relieve all classes, and improve the general prosperity of the country. The labourers, I am sorry to say it, have, during the last two or three years, been reduced to a state of privation almost beyond human endurance and human forbearance. Some relief must be afforded them; but how? If it be by the diminution of the capital of the farmer, that will fall upon the rents;—yes, if the capital of the farmer be reduced, as it necessarily must be, by the augmentation of wages which he has to pay, it will fall upon the rents. It is clear, therefore, that an alteration of rents must take place. The question, therefore, for your consideration is, will you allow it to be made?—for made it certainly will be, in a manner which will not reduce the amount of distress, but which will keep up all the bad workings of a bad system; or will you come—as in honour and in principle you ought to come—to an alteration of the Corn-laws, which will add to the capital of the country, and to the employment of your artisans in the manufacturing towns, and which, by giving that class of your population increased means of subsistence, will spread comfort through every other class of the community connected with them? You have already tried the fatal experiment of the Corn-laws long enough. The injury which you intended to others has recoiled on your own heads. You are the greatest sufferers by it now; and a worse fate than your present, will befall you, if you are infatuated enough to persist in your present course. The prosperity of the country has decayed before it; that decay is still going on, and the question therefore is—will you consent to let the country enjoy that prosperity which I am certain it still can enjoy, if you take off that dead weight,—the Corn-laws,—which now oppresses it? or will you continue to stand by the experiment of the Corn-laws, which even the noble and learned Lord declares to be inefficient for the purposes for which it is designed, for he admits that the agriculture of the country has declined under it? The sooner you come to an alteration of the Corn-laws, and come to it at last you must, the better will it be for yourselves and the country. I shall certainly vote against the Motion of the noble and learned Lord.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* said, that after the support which he had given in the last Session of Parliament to the Motion of his noble friend (Earl Stanhope) for a committee to inquire into the condition of the agricultural interest, he should deem himself guilty of a great inconsistency were he not to support the Motion now proposed by the noble and learned Lord. He did not think that the vote which he intended to give that evening was inconsistent with the professions of confidence which he had made towards the noble

Earl now at the head of the Administration. It was far from his wish to throw any impediment in the way of a Government which had been called upon to take the helm of State in most perilous times, and which had a right to ask, and which he believed would receive, from every well-wisher to his country, all the assistance which it might require. He thought, however, that an inquiry of the character now proposed would be better conducted by a committee of their Lordships than by being left in the hands of the Government. Indeed, the Government had at this time too much upon its hands to give to this question the assiduous and unremitting attention which it required. He agreed with the noble and learned Lord who opened the debate, that the situation of the agricultural interest demanded immediate inquiry. He knew that there was an erroneous impression abroad, that the agricultural interest had stated its position falsely to the country, and that it had not acted with justice to the people in making those fair reductions in rent which it ought. If inquiry were granted, he had no doubt but that it would be proved, that rents were in general reduced to the standard of 1797; indeed, in many parts of England he knew that land was of no value, and that when the legal burthens upon it were paid off, no rent was left to the owner. He admitted that the committee which was appointed the other night might be productive of great advantage. Its inquiries, however, were confined to the mal-administration of the Poor-laws, which affected, and affected severely, one branch of the agricultural interest. That committee could not inquire into the condition of the land-owners and tenantry of the country, and therefore it was, that he said, that the committee which the noble and learned Lord now proposed would be of great advantage. He agreed with that noble and learned Lord in thinking that the unequal pressure of the burthens imposed on the agricultural interest had thrown it to the ground, and had rendered it incapable of struggling any longer with the difficulties which surrounded it. He agreed also with that noble and learned Lord, that it was not just that one interest should bear all the burthens of the country, and that interest should not contribute to them. Why should the support of the poor be thrown entirely upon the produce of the land? Why should the maintenance of the poor be provided for by the land alone? Why, too, should the keeping of the highways in order be defrayed from the same source? Was not the manufacturer as much interested in the maintenance of the public peace, and in the good order of the highways, as the landholder, and ought he not to contribute equally to the support of those burthens? He was convinced that the farmers whose petitions he had presented that evening were correct in stating, that though they had met with a liberal reduction, both of tithes and rent, they were no longer in a situation to do justice to themselves, and to the peasantry whose labour they employed. He believed that their condition was such as they described it to be, and therefore he thought that their Lordships ought to inquire into the causes which had rendered it so wretched. He begged to inform their Lordships that the country was looking at present with interest to the deliberations of Parliament; that it was expecting with confidence that the inquiry which had been denied during the last, would be granted in the present Session, and that it was anxious to have an opportunity of showing that its grievances were real, and were entitled to legislative relief and remedy. He also agreed with the noble and learned Lord in thinking that the recent alterations of the currency had added much to our distress. How could it be otherwise, when we were called upon to pay in a metallic currency the burthens which the country had contracted in a paper currency? He believed that a paper currency under proper restrictions would be productive of great advantage to the community. Entertaining such opinions, he should give his cordial and warm support to the Motion of the noble and learned Lord.

Earl *Stanhope* wished their Lordships to recollect, that he was induced, in the course of the last Session of Parliament, to submit to their consideration a motion in almost every respect similar to the present. That motion was not acceded to by their Lordships, but consistency of conduct, joined to his unaltered opinions, induced him to support the present motion. It had been objected by the noble Earl who spoke first on the other side of the House, that this Motion seemed to imply a want of confidence in the newly-constituted Administration. Upon that point he differed from the noble Earl; considering the Motion of his noble and learned friend, which he should cordially and zealously support, in no respect liable to that objection. So far from being hostile in its nature, or injurious in its effects to the new Administration, it would tend to facilitate and promote those measures which must be adopted to secure peace and prosperity to this unhappy and hitherto ill-conducted State. That, however, was a doctrine which he need not insist upon, since he believed it was acknowledged by all their Lordships, and especially by the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government, that inquiry was the best, and, indeed, the only mode of restoring to prosperity those classes whose interests are inseparably connected with those of the State; and if that prosperity were not restored, the established order of things could not long continue to exist in this country. That inquiry is the best and only mode of arresting the progress of those disturbances which have unfortunately prevailed in so many districts, and which have plunged them into a state of the most fearful anarchy—that it is the best and only mode of affording protection to property, which, owing to bad legislative measures, has long ceased to have any security—that investigation and inquiry are the best and only modes of effecting these objects, no man who reflected upon the subject for one moment could entertain a doubt. Distress and discontent, tumult and disorder, could never be effectually suppressed without inquiry into their causes; or, according to the language of him who had been represented as the wisest of mankind—Lord Bacon—"the way to crush sedition was to expel the matter of it." As to the conduct of the noble Earl and his Administration he was not disposed to speak at any length, for, like other Governments, the present ought to be judged by its measures. But, at the same time, he was not aware that the House was already reduced to that degraded and disgraceful situation that it must repose a blind confidence in the executive government, and must sink, at this awful period, into nothing more than a mere court for the registering of the royal edicts. It might be proper, perhaps, that he should shortly advert—but in doing so he trusted that his observations might not tend to increase that which every good man must wish most anxiously to diminish—to the unfortunate irritation now existing in many parts of the country—it might be proper, perhaps, that he should advert briefly, and in justification of the part taken by so humble an individual as himself, to transactions of no very distant date. As often as opportunities presented themselves in the course of the last Session of Parliament, he had earnestly, but most ineffectually, represented to their Lordships and to the then Administration, that all the productive classes of the community—all those interests which are the most valuable and important, and which it is the bounden duty of the Legislature to protect at almost any sacrifice—that all these classes were suffering under the pressure of severe and unexampled distress—distress equally awful and appalling in its nature and extent, and fearful and alarming in its probable consequences. But in vain did he represent to their Lordships that the continuance of that grievous distress, bearing with severe and intolerable pressure upon all the labouring classes of the community, must inevitably tend to produce great and general discontent. And, in fact, it was impossible discontent should not exist when the owner of the land found, notwithstanding all his reductions of rent—having brought them back in some cases to the standard of the period preceding the late war (and in one case he knew that a party had so reduced his rents, that he did not attempt to collect more, and, in fact, did not receive more than the interest of the money, which he had laid out in the agricultural buildings he had raised upon his land: he said, that it was impossible discontent should not exist when the occupier of the land found—notwithstanding all his skill, his industry, his frugality, prudence and perseverance—his capital daily wasting away expecting it would soon vanish altogether, and seeing no other means of support left to him than to throw himself upon those very rates to which he had previously contributed. He asked, also, whether great and just discontent must not exist when all the industrious and commercial classes,—the shipowners, the manufacturers, the merchants, and the shop-keepers—found that they were carrying on their trade not only without profit, but in some cases with actual loss? And last, but not least, could it be wondered at, that discontent should exist, when the labourers and artizans, were either on the one hand deprived of employment, and were driven, for the means of subsistence, to the poor-rates, —or, on the other were compelled to accept a miserable and insufficient pittance as a reward of their labour. Their Lordships would perhaps recollect, that in addressing them formerly upon this subject, he raised his feeble voice to warn them of the consequences which must arise if some legislative measures of relief were not adopted. Their Lordships would, perhaps, also, do him the honour to recollect that he had represented in a forcible manner, that the then existing distress must inevitably produce danger. That danger is now arrived—a danger greater in magnitude, more formidable in all its circumstances, more tremendous in every respect, than any which has been witnessed since the period of the first French Revolution. He did not wish to assume the sole credit of having descried this danger, it was foreseen and forcibly dwelt upon by the noble Earl who spoke last, and by the noble Duke (Richmond) who, he was happy to find, had become a Member and an ornament of the new Administration. Those noble Peers also submitted motions in the course of the last Session, upon the subject of the distress, but their Lordships, persevering in the same course which they had adopted with respect to his motion, rejected theirs. Notwithstanding all the exertions of those who had the interests of the country really at heart, their Lordships refused to afford relief, and even to grant inquiry. Could they wonder, then, that they had lost the attachment and confidence of the people? He had stated on former occasions, what he then repeated, that if they were inattentive to the interests of the people—regardless of their welfare,—deaf to their complaints—if they refused to inquire into the causes of the general suffering—the greatest of all mischiefs must inevitably occur. That mischief which he and others foresaw and predicted long before it occurred had arrived. They had stated, that if some remedy were not afforded, the suffering and oppressed people, instead of approaching the House with humble petitions—with earnest expostulations—with respectful entreaties—would ere long express their discontent in another and a more dangerous manner. We had now arrived at that period. Proper measures adopted some few months since might, have prevented all the mischief which had taken place; but being now at the eleventh hour, beyond which it was impossible to refuse inquiry with any safety to the country, he entreated their Lordships, without going into all the statements and various arguments which had been urged on former occasions, if they valued the confidence and good opinion of their fellow citizens—which he, for one, was more proud to enjoy than any hereditary honour, or any that Government could bestow —he conjured and entreated them, if they were anxious to preserve to that House its constitutional power,—if they were anxious to rescue the country from a state of disorder, not only without example in its history, but, as far as he knew, unexampled in any country which did not immediately afterwards become the victim of convulsion—he conjured their Lordships, at this awful period, to cast aside all other considerations, and to stand forth boldly, with the determination of performing their duty to their country. With respect to the degree of confidence to be placed in the present Administration, he wished to state his opinion frankly and openly. It was not satisfactory to him to see so large a proportion of the present Cabinet composed of persons whose opinions upon many important subjects were entirely different from his own. He did not consider consistency in error a virtue in statesmen, and therefore he hoped, that the experience and evidence of facts would induce them to consider those particular subjects in a different point of view from that which they had hitherto seized upon. He trusted that this effect would be produced on the noble Duke, for whom he entertained a sincere respect, and whose opinions with respect to the protection due to agriculture were exactly his own, and upon the right hon. Baronet who presided over the naval department, for which he was not, perhaps, particularly qualified, but the duties of which he would, no doubt, endeavour conscientiously to discharge. He could assure the noble Earl at the head of the Government that on two questions he should receive his cordial and zealous support—a support humble and insignificant in itself, and perhaps indifferent to him, but which, at least, had the merit of being conscientious. The first of these questions was that principle of non-interference which he had adopted as the basis of his foreign policy,—a principle which he earnestly trusted would preserve peace without dishonour. The other subject was of still greater importance,—upon which he felt most strongly, and upon which the noble Earl, so far as his statements had hitherto gone, was entitled to the gratitude of the country—he meant Parliamentary Reform. If he were a new convert to that doctrine, he should feel no hesitation in avowing it; but it was many years since he stated his conviction that a reform in the Commons' House of Parliament had become indispensably necessary. That conviction had acquired additional strength from the circumstances and events which had since occurred; and, therefore, he thought the noble Earl at the head of the Government entitled to the gratitude of his country for having undertaken to accomplish such a reform. He certainly meant reform conducted on proper principles, and with cautious prudence,—which would preserve, not destroy—strengthen not impair—the existing institutions of the country; but which would, at the same time, be a real, substantial, and effectual reform of the Commons' House of Parliament. The noble Lord on the Woolsack, had devoted his attention, and employed his powerful abilities, in considering that subject, and he hoped that, when that noble Lord had matured his plan, it would be found well qualified to satisfy the just expectations of the people on the one hand, and to secure the Constitution from the danger of violent innovations on the other. With respect to retrenchment and economy, however desirable they might be in principle, or for the sake of example, as the means of affording any extensive relief to the people in their present distressed state, they must be totally ineffective,—and he thought their Lordships held out a delusive hope when they promised relief by retrenchment or by reduction of taxation. He was convinced that the burthens of the country could not be so much reduced as to afford any sensible relief to the people. On the currency, which had been adverted to, by his noble and learned friend, he should say but a very few words. Their Lordships were, indeed, already aware of his opinions upon that subject, and therefore he should not repeat them. Their Lordships, however, ought not to disguise from themselves the situation in which they were placed with respect to this question. They had but two alternatives, both of which were full of difficulty, but from which they could not escape. The one alternative was, by a return to a paper currency, to raise prices, or, if they rejected that, and persevered in supporting the present metallic currency, then the only other alternative was to reduce all payments to the same scale. If they maintained the metallic currency, they must regulate all the payments for the Debt, and all the establishments of the country by the standard of 1792, and such a change could not be effected without convulsion. These, however, were the only alternatives left to Government, and one or other it must adopt—there was no third course—no royal road more than to geometry to national prosperity. On the Corn-laws his opinions remained unchanged; but as this subject was adverted to by the noble and learned Lord who brought forward the Motion, and as his observations had been answered at considerable length by the noble Baron (Lord King) he might, perhaps, be pardoned for saying a few words upon it. If, to protect the productive classes, the present, or any other Government, should consider that there ought to be a perfectly free trade in corn—that it should be admitted at all times and in all quantities, without the payment of any duty, to that he should make no opposition, if it were accompanied by the conditions he should presently state. He was ready to vote instantly for an entire abolition of the Corn-laws, provided at the same time, their Lordships would take measures to enable the corn-grower of this country to compete with the foreign grower on equal terms. Let justice be done to all parties. If corn, as a necessary of life, is to be imported without duty, let articles of every kind that can by possibility be introduced into the country, be also imported duty free—let no tax be made to bear exclusively on the agriculturist—let the poor-rates be borne equally by the manufacturers, who now contributed no share towards them—let funded property bear an equal part of the national burthens—above all, let every tax which immediately affects the agriculturist be removed. Abolish the malt-duty, the hop-duty, the tax on British spirits, and all other taxes whatever, which press exclusively on the industry of the agriculturists—do this, and then abolish, if their Lordships pleased, the whole system of Corn-laws. If they meant to undertake such an abolition, let them look to the consequences; let them look at the conditions to which they must necessarily submit. No argument taken from the writings of the most eminent political writers, illustrated by the speeches of the noble Baron, would be sufficient to convince the owners, occupiers, and cultivators of land that the Corn-laws ought to be abolished, and that this country ought to depend for its support entirely on a foreign supply. Before their Lordships could carry the abolition of the Corn-laws, they must, therefore, abolish all the taxes to which he had alluded, and even then they must expect to encounter the opposition and even the hostility of all persons connected with the land. Here he could not refrain from noticing an observation which had been made by a noble Earl (Rosebery) on the opposite side of the House, who seemed to take so imperfect and narrow a view of the state of the country, as to suppose that all the distress originated from a mal-administration of the Poor-laws. That was a most mistaken notion. What was the cause that so many of the labouring poor were out of employment? Why were their Lordships now occupied in an examination of the situation of the distressed poor, and of the pressure of those laws which were passed for their relief? The cause was this—and it would not be denied by any man at all acquainted with the real situation of the country—the landed proprietors had no longer the means of giving the same employment as formerly. While, on the one hand, labourers had an undoubted right to expect a fair and proper remuneration for their labour (for Holy Writ said, that "the labourer was worthy of his hire;") on the other hand, it was impossible, with the present prices of produce, that the cultivators of the soil could afford an adequate remuneration for the services of their workmen. In short, the measures adopted with respect to the currency in the years 1819 and 1826, had not only been edicts of confiscation, but also commissions of bankruptcy—issued against all the owners and occupiers of land in the country. Was there ever a time, he would ask, in the memory of the oldest Peer, or in the oldest times, in which the active interference of a Government was so much required to alleviate the distress of a people? He felt great sorrow and surprise that, as soon as the motion was made, the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government did not immediately rise in his place and express his cordial concurrence in it; for whatever might be the industry of his Majesty's Ministers (and he entertained no doubt upon that point) whatever might be the talent of the individual members of the Cabinet, (which he did not dispute)—it was utterly impossible, occupied as they were by the arduous and important duties which belonged to their office, that they could devote sufficient attention to the investigation of such a subject as that of the distress of the country. Much assistance, therefore, would be afforded them by the inquiries of such a committee as that his noble and learned friend had moved for. It was very easy, when a motion of this kind was submitted to the House, to find out some argument or another to meet it; and thus the noble Earl who opposed it had also opposed, though not exactly upon the same ground, but with equal pertinacity, a motion which he (Earl Stanhope) made in February last, but who in the following month, lent his support to a motion for a somewhat more limited inquiry. If any inquiry were necessary then, what reason could be assigned why a general inquiry was not necessary now? Were their Lordships to confine their investigation to one part, when there were many others which required their attention and consideration; and when inquiry could no longer be delayed without danger. He saw on the other side of the House a noble Earl (Darnley) connected, like himself, with the county of Kent, who was pleased, during the former Session, to contradict, repeatedly, all the allegations respecting the severe and unprecedented distress which existed in that county, as well as in some others. The noble Earl did not venture to state that there was no distress at all; but he confined it to as narrow a space as possible, and contended, that the statements of distress were exaggerated—not to say absurd. The noble Earl even went so far as to caution the House against such statements, but would the noble Earl, or any other noble Lord connected with Kent, or any of the disturbed districts, still continue to maintain that those statements were exaggerated? Would they still maintain with the country in a state of conflagration from midnight incendiaries, that there was no ground for inquiry? There was no necessity for him to point out to their Lordships the melancholy results of the apathy of the late Ministry; or to inflict upon them, the pain of beholding the lamentable situation in which the country is placed,—a situation which inflicted indelible disgrace upon the immediate predecessors of the present Ministers. He regretted as much as any man those turbulent proceedings which for so long a period were happily averted; but which were spreading throughout the country. He had no doubt but that the earnest attention of the present Government would be directed to suppress these violent and tumultuous proceedings; but the best mode of opposing them was not by sending those circulars which appeared to be so much in fashion with the noble Viscount at the head of the Home Department. The only mode of effectually putting an end to these tumults was, to investigate the cause from which they originated. This, if not done by the Ministry, it was the duty of their Lordships to undertake; a sacred duty imposed on them by their station, and they could not neglect to investigate the causes of the evils which afflict and alarm the whole country, endeavouring by the best means in their power to afford speedy and effectual relief, without giving up all their functions, and placing in jeopardy their own property, and the best institutions of the State. He had already detained their Lordships longer than he intended; but there was still one observation which he wished to make, in reference to what had fallen from his noble friend upon the cross-bench, with respect to machinery. If his noble and learned friend had considered the objections which had been urged against machinery, he would have found that they were confined almost exclusively to machinery of recent introduction, which materially supersedes the employment of manual labour. To these objections he was disposed to assent; but was it therefore to be supposed, because some machinery was objectionable, that all should be abolished? Certainly not. Justice and regard for the rights of the labouring poor ought to impose some restriction on those who possessed any of the recently-invented agricultural machinery, and they should discontinue its use. Many arguments might be adduced in favour of machinery; but in these times, the opinion of every person who possessed any knowledge upon the subject was, that it is the duty of those who have hitherto employed domestic machinery to discontinue its use. Of all the descriptions of machinery, none was more injurious than that which deprived the agricultural labourer of the opportunity to exert his manual skill—it deprived him of that which was his capital—and reduced him to a state of pauperism. Reverting, then, to the motion before the House, he must say, that he hoped that those noble Lords who had assumed the reins of Government, would give a pledge of their sincerity, by affording the means of immediate inquiry into the distress of the country, with a view to afford relief. He was sure, and he stated it with sorrow, that the dangers of this country might have been prevented by a timely application of prudent and wise measures. Neglected, however, as the people had been, outrage and violence might increase to such an extent as to overwhelm us with ruin, if redress were longer delayed. And if,—notwithstanding what the noble Earl asserted,—if on this, as on almost every other occasion of a like kind, a change of Ministry was not to produce a change of measures—if the same system was to be pursued—if the same evils were to be continued—if inquiry was to be refused—or if it were to be postponed till an uncertain and indefinite time, perhaps to a distant period—if no relief from those intolerable grievances which threatened destruction to the country were instantly given;—if all these things occurred, it would become a matter of serious consideration with him and those who thought with him, whether it would be proper for them any longer to continue the semblance of discussion in that House, or whether they should not retire altogether, leaving to those who might choose to remain, the undisturbed and undivided responsibility of their measures, and of all the calamities and convulsions which might be the results.

The Earl of *Rosebery* explained, that the noble Earl had very much misrepresented, undoubtedly because he misunderstood, what fell from him. He was far from thinking that the committee to consider of the Poor-laws was sufficient to ascertain all the causes of the distress of the labouring classes. What he meant was, that after an inquiry had been instituted by the House into one of those causes, and after the Ministers had stated that they would investigate the subject, he considered it inexpedient to enter into a more extended inquiry.

The Earl of *Eldon* also explained, that the noble Earl did not quite understand the observations which he made upon the subject of machinery. Upon the motion before the House he could only repeat, that after the best consideration he had been able to give to the state of the country, he deemed inquiry necessary; and should support the Motion.

The Earl of *Radnor* wished to state, very shortly, the reasons which induced him to vote against the Motion. He was the more especially anxious to claim this indulgence, after the speeches of the two noble Earls who last addressed the House, because from their arguments it would appear, that he should act most inconsistently with his former conduct in voting against this Motion. The circumstances of the present case were, however, totally different from those under which he voted last Session, and this alone he deemed a sufficient apology, if apology were necessary, for the vote he meant to give. But before he entered more fully into a description of this change of circumstances, he felt it incumbent upon him to allude a little to the spirit in which this Motion had been introduced. The noble and learned Lord, in moving for a committee to inquire into all the causes of distress, had stated in a very able and animated manner what he conceived those causes to be. They were sufficiently numerous; and to meet his wishes, the committee, which he called upon their Lordships to appoint, would, among other things, have to inquire into the nature and operation of the Poor-laws, the Corn-laws, Free-trade, the Currency system, and the question of encouraging or discouraging machinery. He should like to ask how any body of men, whether in a committee or out of it, could bring their minds properly and fully to investigate all these subjects? Differences of opinion would necessarily arise among the members of any committee, which would effectually preclude them from arriving at any practicable results. The noble Earl who spoke last expressed an opinion in favour of regulating the use of machinery—but only to a certain extent—that which has been recently introduced. Upon that point alone how many points of dissension might arise! Some noble Lords, perhaps, would think that, under this appellation of recently introduced machinery, were included thrashing machines—others that it included ploughs and the ordinary implements used to further the progress of cultivation. How would it be possible for any committee to decide by any fixed principle a point of this kind? Similar difficulties would arise upon the great questions of the Currency and the Corn-laws. In short, it was vain—not to say absurd--to suppose, that subjects so weighty and multifarious could, of possibility, be properly considered by one committee. And he must say that, generally speaking, although he supported a motion of this kind in the last Session of Parliament,—and although he had frequently supported motions for inquiry—still he was of opinion that, in modern times, no good could result from them, because they took too much out of the hands of Ministers—relieved them of the responsibility imposed on them, and if they did well, deprived them of much of the merit which was their due. Generally speaking, therefore, he was opposed to all committees for general inquiry. On the present occasion, he could not agree with his noble and learned friend, that the country had arrived at such a state as to render it imperative upon their Lordships to enter into the inquiry he proposed. The present Motion was submitted to their Lordships under extraordinary circumstances, of which none struck him more than the tone and manner in which the noble Earl who had just addressed the House, had advocated the necessity of a reform in Parliament. Were he a Member, indeed, of the other House of Parliament, where he had spent so many years of his political life, when the necessity of reform was admitted on all hands—and was actually to become a Government measure—he might perhaps move for a committee, though not such a one as that proposed by the noble and learned Lord. "If," said the noble Earl, "I had a seat this Session in the other House of Parliament, I should most probably vote for—not a committee with respect to reform—for that would be unnecessary—but for the impeachment of the members of the late Government, who went out of Office leaving the country in the most perilous condition—in a state verging on the actual dissolution of society—and that, too, without being visited by the vengeance of an insulted and—"

Lords Teynham and Stanhope rose to order.

The latter noble Lord read the fifteenth

Resolution on the Journals, which forbad "all personal attacks" like to that of the noble Earl.

The Earl of *Radnor*:—"I do not intend my observations in a personal sense. I had no personal allusion. I could not have any personal feelings against the late Government individually; and spoke of them only in their aggregate ministerial capacity. I will, besides, not stand by the word 'vengeance.' It was not, perhaps, the very exact phrase I meant. Your Lordships must perceive that my expressions come to me but slowly, and I am oftentimes therefore obliged to put up with the first that comes, not having the choice of a selection. While I state this with respect to the word 'vengeance,' I beg leave to add that, I do not at all retract the sentiment which it was intended to express." The noble Earl proceeded to say, that he thought the Motion for inquiry uncalled for in itself, as well as unjust to the new Government. It should be recollected that the noble Earl (Grey) and his colleagues opposite had been but three weeks in Office, and yet they had at the earliest hour stated their determination to apply their best energies to the investigation and remedy of the distressed condition of the country. It was, apart from the impolicy of relieving Ministers from the responsibility of the exercise of their executive functions, but justice and common fairness to await the result of their pledges. He was no blind adherent to any set of men, but placed great confidence in the present Administration, knowing that it possessed more ability, knowledge, and fewer prejudices, than any within his recollection. It was but fair, then, to give them a trial. If after the recess they should fail to redeem their pledges, the noble and learned Lord might come forward with his Motion under circumstances much more favourable to its success than possibly could exist at present. Besides, the House was then about to adjourn for some six or seven weeks,—so that, if even the noble Lord's Committee were appointed, it could not have more than one or two sittings till the month of February,—before which time, it was but fair to presume, Ministers would be prepared with some measure of domestic policy, which would supersede inquiry by the objectionable form of committee. Did the noble Lord mean that Parliament should continue to sit through the Christmas holidays? If he did, he might be assured that noble Lords, as well as the Members of the other House, would be much more advantageously employed in respect to the public interest by spending the ensuing weeks in the country, at their respective residences, and by precept and example enforcing obedience to the laws—inquiring into and extending relief to the distressed labouring classes—than by profitless and tedious discussion in committee, from which no beneficial result could follow. Their Lordships could not too anxiously investigate with their own eyes the present state of the country, with a view to a remedy, and to prevent its recurrence. It was impossible to exaggerate the sad picture which so many parts of the country presented. The social arrangements of society were every day falling asunder, the links which held it together were every hour loosening, and the body corporate, from the sole of the foot to the crown of the head—so to speak —was one foul mass—diseased, and full of putrid sores. For the last fifty years the Governments of this country had been pursuing the one fatal course of adding to the burthens of the poor, by unequal taxes and most oppressive laws, while they guarded with the most jealous eye every so-called privilege of the wealthier, but less industrious, classes; and the country was now only beginning to experience the inevitable fruits of such mischievous conduct in the discontent which rankled in the bosoms of the labouring classes, and in the feelings of vindictive hostility with which they regarded the class above them, which feelings it was to be feared would be adopted by the several ranks of society to those above them, till all were swallowed in some great convulsion. The people had long waited in patience for a redress of their grievances, but had waited in vain. They were told to petition; they had petitioned, for the great remedy of their ills—a reform in Parliament; in one year upwards of 1,000,000 petitioners had approached Parliament for this purpose; but the petitions were rejected with scorn, and were not even read. But he trusted that a better state of things would arise from the beneficial change which had recently taken place in the national councils. The Ministers had come into Office under most arduous circumstances; he heartily wished them success in their honest endeavours, and he would on no account be a party to any measures like the present inquiry, which should tend to hamper their course.

The Duke of *Wellington* had, last Session, opposed a motion similar to that then before their Lordships, and would, for the same reasons, now oppose the present Motion. He was as alive as any man who heard him to the distressed state of the country, and had never attempted to extenuate it. But it was absurd to attribute it to any measure of the Administration of which he had been a member, as had been asserted by the noble Earl who had just addressed the House. With respect to the broad censure on the late Government, cast by that noble Earl, he on the part of himself and his colleagues, challenged the noble Earl to come forward and prove, that the distress and disturbance which disfigured many districts of the country were at all owing to any of their measures or their general policy. Let the noble Earl, if he thought so, come forward with a distinct proposition of inquiry, and he promised to meet him. He had last Session opposed a motion, as he had stated, like the present, because he agreed with that noble Earl that it would be prejudicial to the general interests of the country instead of being a benefit; and because it embraced several most important subjects, each of which would require a long and undivided consideration. The noble and learned Lord who proposed the inquiry had pointed out, as topics for investigation our financial and monetary system, our commercial policy, the Poor-laws, the Corn-laws, and the use of machinery. It was impossible for any committee to thoroughly sift all these important questions, or come to any practical decision on them; so that the disappointment of the expectations which its appointment must excite in the public mind, would be ten times more mischievous in its results than the grievance for which it was intended as a remedy. It was not just, besides, to the Ministers who had so recently come into Office, to thus involve them in difficulties from which they could have no time to extricate themselves. He had last Session objected to such a motion, because it would then have involved Ministers in difficulties, and for that reason, in addition to the other reasons on which he had then resisted it, he would, he repeated, vote against the present Motion. Their Lordships had already a committee inquiring into the abuses of the Poor-laws, with a view to a remedy, and that committee might very easily extend its investigations to the question mooted by the noble Earl (Stanhope) on the cross-bench,—viz. the expediency of a better distribution of poor-rates among the manufacturers and funded interests, and to other analogous topics connected with the distress of the country, without exceeding the bounds prescribed for its inquiries, and without the necessity of appointing another committee. He had not, as he had before stated, attempted to extenuate the dangerous condition of the country, but would most emphatically deny that it had any connexion with any measure of the late Government, or that it could in any way be said to originate from any portion of the policy pursued by him and his late colleagues. "No," said the noble Duke, "the dangers and disturbances with which some districts of the country have been some time infested, have sprung from very different causes, among which, the example—I will unhesitatingly say, the bad example—afforded by the neighbouring States, has been the most influential, as it has been the most pernicious. This has been encouraged and heightened by the misrepresentations and false ideas which have been too generally circulated throughout the country, of the causes and the character of the unfortunate events which occurred last summer in an adjoining kingdom; and above all, by a want of knowledge on the part of the people of the real nature of those events, and of the mischiefs sure to follow from imitating them. These were the causes of the present disturbed condition of the country, and not any measure of the late Government; and if the noble Earl thinks otherwise, let him point out what measure or what course of policy of ours led to this state; and, as I before said, I shall be prepared to meet him." The fact was, the causes of the distressed condition of certain districts, which they all lamented, were beyond the reach or the control of any Government. How, for example, could any Ministers provide a prompt remedy for the distress of the labouring classes as it arose from an abuse of the Poor-laws; or could they act otherwise with respect to the disturbances than as the noble Viscount at the head of the Home Department had acted, so far as precept was concerned—and by example, each according to his abilities and station?

He and his colleagues had gone as far as they could go constitutionally with a view to remedy the distresses of the country, and it was too much to insinuate, as had been done, that they had neglected their duty. He had even heard it whispered, that the late Ministers had been neglectful of the progress of the disturbances which disfigured some districts of the country. This was not the fact. From the very first moment they had devised and adopted every means in their power for aiding with their advice—and, if unfortunately necessary, with force—the local magistrates in their endeavours to preserve the public peace. It was plain that Ministers could not do more, and that the details of the administration of justice, and of enforcing the laws so as to suppress disturbance, must be left to the discretion and vigilance of the Magistrates on the spot. From the very first moment that his noble friend, the Lord-lieutenant for the county of Kent, had communicated to him—and he believed he was the first member of the late Government who had heard of the disturbance—respecting the discontent and commotions in that county, he and his colleagues had unceasingly applied themselves to get the better of them. "The noble Earl," continued the noble Duke, "who has imputed this discontent to our policy, has, however, shifted his ground, and after calling for vengeance on us of the late Administration, ascribes the present disturbed state of the public mind to the unwise impolicy of the Governments of the last fifty years,—implicating of course, my noble and learned friend (Eldon) on the Cross-bench. On this point I must say, that my noble and learned friend had as much hand in the present disturbances of the country as I had; for I repeat, it was not till the misfortunes, for such I consider them, of July and August last, had happened in a neighbouring State; and had been misrepresented in their character and origin, that the people here were induced to follow the bad example held out to them; and since that not, having been enlightened as to the mischievous consequences of following that example, the condition of the labouring classes assumed its present aspect. During our Administration, my Lords, we did all we could to relieve the people. In last Session 3,900,000*l.* worth of taxation was taken off; and since then the commercial and manufacturing interests of the country generally have been in a state of prosperity and tranquillity, except in those districts where there are gross and disgraceful disturbances. These, however, I trust, are but local and temporary. Indeed, I am emboldened to think that they are so; for with the exception of these gross and disgracefully disturbed districts, an improving revenue, and increased consumption and demand for our manufactures and commodities, show that the country at large is in a state of tranquillity and prosperity. The noble Duke concluded by saying, my Lords, I have, in consequence of the attack of the noble Earl, trespassed longer on your attention than I otherwise should have done, or than I trust I shall again find necessary.

The Earl of *Eldon* with reference to the insinuation of the noble Earl (Radnor) begged to say, that it was amongst the greatest of his consolations, on a retrospect of his political life, that he had always advocated political principles the very opposite to those maintained by the noble Earl.

Earl *Grey* said, that what he had to state might be put in a very small compass. He did not feel himself called upon to state his opinions and views respecting the various subjects which had been introduced by the noble and learned Lord. He was not prepared for it. He had no reason to expect that the discussion would have taken such a course. He did not feel called upon to touch on subjects, each of which would require long and anxious consideration. He did not feel qualified at the moment to enter on the Corn-laws, or the novel proposition respecting machinery, which had been broached by a noble Earl. He did not think he could do so with honour to himself, or advantage to the country. He asked the noble Earl what he meant by ancient machinery—was it a spade—was it a plough—or did he mean to retain the rude implements of agriculture, and reject all improvements? He objected to the committee upon the grounds set forth by the noble Earl, who spoke before the noble Duke, and he thought the course pursued that night fully demonstrated the inutility of a committee such as was moved for by the noble and learned Lord. To the Committee on the Poor-laws he had given his cheerful assent, feeling that inquiry might be useful, as it was likely to lead to the correction of that which was known to be a great evil, namely, the mal-administration of these laws; and also of those defects which had, to a certain extent perverted them from the benevolent purposes to which they had been originally directed. For the distress of the country he felt most acutely, as every man with a heart must feel, although he believed it was much exaggerated in the glowing description of the noble Lord, and he thought that some practical result respecting it might be arrived at by the committee on the Poor-laws. Therefore had he consented to that committee, concluding that the public distress would immediately come under its consideration, and its attention be thus directed to the consideration of the labouring portion of the community. To that the attention of his Majesty's Ministers ought in the first instance to be applied, and if they can ascertain, that by any alteration of the laws, or by any modification of our institutions, or by any new enactment, the relief of the present distress of that portion of the people, and the permanent amelioration of their condition can be effected, it would be their duty to submit such measures to the consideration of Parliament without delay. But he greatly doubted that any beneficial consequences would result from the committee proposed by the noble and learned Lord. It was true that he had often supported applications for committees: but in doing so he should always wish to observe the distinction laid down by a noble Lord opposite, to whom he should return his sincere thanks for the kind disposition which he had expressed towards the members of the present Administration. In acquiescing in, or in opposing, a proposal for a committee, he should, of course, be greatly influenced by the object of the inquiry, by the time, and by the mode in which it was applied for. He was almost ashamed to repeat what had been already more than once objected, that it was impossible to see any way through the mass of subjects which the noble Lord had introduced. First, there was the question of rents and the division of farms. Now, he (Earl Grey) did not know whether the noble and learned Lord contemplated interfering with the rights of property; but whether such was his intention or not, all matters respecting the amount of rents, and the extent of farms, would be much better regulated by the individuals who were immediately interested than by any committee of their Lordships. In those, as in most cases, the interference of the Legislature, in prescribing to individuals the mode in which they are to regulate their own property, was most likely to produce a contrary effect to that which had been anticipated. He certainly did think that the mode in which some taxes in this country were imposed; perhaps, in some measure, the policy by which the imposition of them had been directed, and, in many instances, the nature of the taxes themselves, deserved deep consideration. It might be expedient to inquire whether by the alteration of some, and by the removal, or by the diminution of others, the country might not derive great benefit. But he could not enter into the multitudinous topics of the noble and learned Lord's speech. Something had been said about consulting the ease of the Administration by the appointment of the committee. God knows! there was no situation of life more generally full of difficulty and trouble than that of the Ministers of the Crown, and at the present moment the ordinary difficulties and trouble were enhanced tenfold. For them it was no time to think of ease or take refuge in a committee from any of the heavy responsibility they had taken upon themselves. He should not have much objection to the noble and learned Lord taking with him to a room above stairs a few of the noble Lords near him, who were desirous of having the committee. Let it not be supposed that he would shrink from the performance of his duty. He would, as readily as any Minister that had preceded him, come down there and call on Parliament for inquiry, when the interests of the nation might render it necessary. Should an emergency require it, he would not hesitate to enter upon any investigation, or to meet by special legislation an important occasion, for which existing laws did not provide; but he could not consent to a proceeding from which he had no hope that any good could result. With respect to the question of the currency, one of the topics referred to by the noble and learned Lord, that had already been discussed in two or three committees. That subject alone would furnish the noble Lord quite work enough, without touching upon any one of those numerous matters which he proposed to investigate at the same time. Now, he had no hesitation in saying, that there had been many unfortunate mistakes in the interference of the Legislature with the currency of the kingdom. A noble Lord had referred to something which he (Earl Grey) had said last year when presenting a petition. It was quite true, that he did, on that occasion, or on some occasion, say that it was a strange anomaly to have the currency in Ireland and in Scotland regulated on one principle, whilst that of England was regulated upon another directly contrary. He would by no means say, that he had since altered his opinion in that respect; but, however much he believed the late Government to have erred in the measures which they had adopted affecting the currency, still he should pause before he consented to entertain any proposition for another change. He believed that great evil must be occasioned by creating any doubt as to the stability of the present regulations. There was great danger in exciting agitation respecting it, and that danger he would not willingly consent to risk. As to the question of the Corn-laws, which the noble and learned Lord had also introduced, he did not know that he had much to reply. All the interest which he possessed in the world was in land; and, though he would not pretend to be exempt from the common frailties of human nature, yet he hoped he had considered that question fully, and, he believed, disinterestedly and dispassionately. He was entirely convinced, as the result of his investigations, that the ultimate interest of the people themselves required that the agriculture of the country should be protected; because, without such a protection, the people could not be assured, in all seasons, of a sufficient, a certain, and he would add, a cheap, supply. He believed that principle was generally acquiesced in, though a few persons yet objected to it. He knew, indeed, that there were some persons who had the courage to recommend the entire abolition of the laws which regulated the trade in corn; but, for his part, he had not nerves to undertake so hazardous an experiment, for he knew well that if it should fail, the evils which it would occasion could not be remedied. They would lead to the destruction of the country. Although such were his opinions, yet he was not so wedded to the Corn-laws as to say, that if the subject were introduced at a proper season, he would oppose the consideration of it; but he must say, that no question of such a nature ought to be introduced in a season of great popular excitement. It was the opinion of many persons well acquainted with the subject, that the country had greatly benefitted by those laws—that they had greatly promoted the improvement of its agriculture, and led to an increased supply of corn. But he had a second opinion respecting them, which was, that there could hardly be a greater evil than that the state of the law affecting the agricultural interests should be fluctuating, and subject to continual changes. Repeated alterations produced evils which could not be compensated for by the benefits expected from the improvement. He would repeat, that at a proper season he should not resist an inquiry into the subject; but at present, when the agitation of it could not fail to be mischievous, he was unwilling to go into the inquiry on that ground alone, independently of his conviction that the Corn-laws had produced to the country, not evil but great good. But there, again, such a field of discussion was opened by the introduction of that topic, that if the proposed committee should apply itself to the investigation of that alone, they would find ample employment for the whole Session. Now he would ask the noble and learned Earl opposite (Eldon), who was so great an enemy to delay upon the present occasion, however friendly to it on others, did he expect to proceed promptly and vigorously by the means which he had proposed? Could he expect to gain with promptitude and speed, by a Commission of Inquiry, the object which he professed to have in view? Could he bring before a committee the numerous questions of which he had that evening spoken, in such a shape as to afford hope of a speedy determination? With respect to the complaint made by the noble and learned Lord who introduced the Motion that capital could not find employment—that it consequently lay unproductive in the money-chest of the capitalist, he would ask, was the assertion consistent with other statements of the noble and learned Lord himself? He was sure the noble and learned Lord opposite, who had made the complaint, was himself the last man in the world who would, like the grasping and discontented usurer, hoard up his gold under locks and bolts, until the prospect of excessive gain should tempt him to release it. That the employment of capital was not now so productive as it had been at some other periods was quite true; but he hoped that, before long, the renovated activity in other departments of the national commerce would enable capital also to find employment. However, the fact that the rate of interest was then lower than it had been at any former period, far from showing that capital was locked up, completely proved the contrary. The lower rate of interest was occasioned by the greater liberality with which capital was employed. When there were such great differences of opinion on every one of the complicated and intricate subjects mentioned by the noble and learned Lord, was it to be supposed that a committee would come to a speedy decision upon subjects that were not only complicated and intricate, but so numerous, and, in some respects, so contradictory, as those comprehended in the speech of the noble and learned Lord whose Motion was before the House? Although he would not (as he had said) object to inquiry when it could be entered upon with a prospect of advantage, he must oppose the present Motion, because he believed that it had been shown, not only by himself, but by other noble Lords who preceded him, that the proposed inquiry offered no such prospect. The mode in which those various subjects had been introduced, gave rise to great doubts and difficulties, and he was unable to follow the noble Lord in so complicated a discussion. He (Earl Grey) knew, and he deeply regretted the evils which then afflicted the country. He allowed, as had been observed by the noble Duke opposite, that occurrences which had taken place in other countries had had some effect in aggravating those evils, and had been taken advantage of by evil-disposed persons, to operate on the minds of the unthinking, or of the unhappy and discontented. Of that he had no doubt. Yet he could not see how the proposed committee could lead to the discovery of a remedy. At all events, every purpose which the Motion of the noble and learned Lord contemplated, would be much more readily attained by the committee already appointed to investigate the most important objects of the present Motion. For the decision of that committee he was disposed to wait; but if, in the mean time, good grounds should be produced for inquiry, which could afford a reasonable hope of success, he would be willing to enter upon it. But he would ask noble Lords, whether, considering the character and objects of the inquiry, the season at which it was proposed did not furnish in itself an insuperable objection to the committee? With respect to what had been said concerning the approaching adjournment, he would say, that noble Lords would not suspend the business of the House for the sake of the usual relaxation of the season if, by continuing to attend in their places, they could promote the welfare of the State. But he believed, that so far from advancing the public good by sitting there in discussions, of which the termination could not be foreseen, he believed that their protracted absence from their respective districts would be injurious. In the present state of the country, nothing was more desirable than that persons of property and influence should as soon as possible have an opportunity of promoting tranquillity in those parts of the country where they respectively resided, using, in the first instance, their power to repress disorder; and in the next, their influence to cultivate amongst the different classes, a better spirit than now, unhappily, seemed to prevail. It should be borne in mind, that the peace and tranquillity of the country required from the magistracy such vigorous measures as would effectually put an end to the outrageous proceedings by which some districts were disgraced. He had heard with concern the remarks which had been made respecting circulars recently issued by the noble Lord near him, as Secretary of State (Lord Melbourne.) The purpose of that letter was, to encourage those Magistrates, who had been active in the discharge of their duty, and to make known to those Magistrates who had allowed themselves to be intimidated into compliance with the exactions of the turbulent, that they increased the mischief by their weakness. Some had not only themselves acquiesced in the violent demands made upon them, but had published advertisements recommending the discontinuance of machinery. Such conduct, far from allaying the discontent, was calculated most grievously to aggravate it. In that, those gentlemen had acted quite inconsistently, not only with the duty of Magistrates deriving authority from recognised laws, but with the wisdom of legislators. If the turbulent were told that clamour, violence, and tumult would prevail over the laws, there would be for ever an end to peaceful society and to regular government. He hoped that it would not be necessary to use the sword of the law (of which a noble Lord had spoken) further than for the punishment of those who instigated to outrage the simple and undesigning. He hoped that they would be brought to justice, and, at the same time, he trusted that every thing would be done to remove that distress, which had brought men into such a temper that mischievous men could obtain an influence over their minds. In the multitude of subjects which that discussion had embraced, some had doubtless escaped his attention. He had said enough to inform the House of his objections to the Motion; but in the situation in which he then stood, and in which he had been so recently placed, he would not oppose the general wish, should it be against his own opinion. It was sincerely his conviction, that if the Committee were granted it would produce no good. A noble Lord had said, that their Lordships ought not to place a blind confidence in the Administration. Ministers did not desire such confidence. It was acknowledged on all hands that the present was a season of great difficulty. How that difficulty had been produced it was not for him to say. He was much more inclined to consider how evils could be remedied than to inquire how they had arisen. Although he concurred in great part of the policy of the late Administration—although he was indebted to it for carrying that long delayed measure of justice and humanity, which he believed would conduce to the security and prosperity of Ireland, and although it was not his wish to make invidious reflections of any kind; yet it would be affectation not to state his belief, that the difficulties of the present Ministry had resulted from the impolicy of former Governments, through a long series of years, from the beginning of the American war downwards, but especially from the French Revolution, and the war unjustly and unnecessarily entered into, as he would ever maintain, in consequence of that event. He had opposed all those measures in succession, as well as the policy in which they had originated. To them he attributed, not only the immense taxation under which the country laboured, but a long train of evils besides. It was now unavailing to look back. Ministers must assiduously apply themselves to devise and to put into practice an efficient remedy; and for that purpose it was necessary that their Lordships should allow them to prosecute the subject with no more interruption than the regular business of Parliament rendered unavoidable. Beyond that, they would require no indulgence, nor claim any confidence. He had stated to the House the principles on which the Government was to be carried on, and Ministers did not expect to derive from the nation the necessary support for their proceedings, without proving by practical measures, that they deserved its confidence.

Lord *Teynham* was convinced, that some inquiry was necessary, and he should support the Motion, with an amendment, which he would take the liberty to move, viz. that the subject of the Poor-laws be omitted from the inquiry of the committee.

The Duke of *Newcastle* meant to oppose the Motion of the noble and learned Lord. The responsibility of Government should be perfect, and when Ministers took upon themselves to do what was their duty, he for one did not think the interference of the House was necessary. It was the duty of that House to see that Ministers did what was right, and the country could not show too much gratitude to them, if, under existing circumstances, they performed their functions with reference to the interests of the community. He hoped, that his Majesty's Ministers would pursue the part of a parental Government, and administer to the wants and necessities of the country.

The Earl of *Fife* thought, that it was not right to hold out fallacious hopes, and in the present state of the country, he thought the Motion ought to be resisted. The present agitation arose from a want of consideration for each other by several parties. The manufacturers blamed the masters, and the tenants blamed the landlords; but all parties should be disposed to unite in a disposition to relieve the poor, and in the principle of "live and let live." Many persons talked of Parliamentary Reform as a measure that would suffice to relieve the country; but without attributing to it that magic power which would remove all our difficulties, he thought that the time was now arrived when it could not be longer withheld. At the same time he would say, that in a reform their Lordships should proceed with caution, in order to guard against confusion and anarchy. But reform should not be confined to one point. We should have a reform in the law, civil and criminal; and without that, any retrenchment, however extensive, would not be sufficient. To one part of our law he was anxious to call the attention of Government, — that of arrest for debt, which he considered a stain upon the national character. It rendered many persons desperate in their circumstances, and if duly examined, it would no doubt be found that it was as little adapted to benefit the creditor as the debtor. In one part of our law a measure had been introduced by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack in which he cordially concurred. It was a plan by which litigation would be made cheaper, and justice would be brought near to every man's door. From the effect of such a mode of administering the law he anticipated much good to the country. It would be well if, in any modification of the criminal code, their Lordships would look to the state of the criminal law in Scotland, where it was much more mild than in this country, but where, nevertheless, it was found more efficient for the repression and punishment of crime. The attention of their Lordships would, he hoped, be directed not only to those points to which he had adverted, but also to the Poor-laws, the Corn-laws; and even the question of tithes required their serious attention, as also the laws of landlord and tenant, and many others by which the interests of the poorer classes were effected. If conciliatory measures, founded upon a consideration of these laws, with a view to their improvement, were adopted, he had no doubt it would restore peace and confidence to the country. The people were looking with confidence to the sincere disposition known to exist in our excellent Monarch and his amiable Consort to encourage every measure which would tend to relieve their distresses. As to the new Ministry, he would only say, that if they pursued a moderate course, and made it their study to uphold the interest, the welfare, and the honour of the country, they would meet with deserved support. The country was possessed of great resources, which well-timed and temperate measures would call forth so as to enable her to meet and overcome all her difficulties. If any thing could for a moment make him despair of the condition of the country, it would be the knowledge of that malignant feeling which existed in some quarters, amongst those only he hoped, who did not reflect—against a noble Duke lately at the head of his Majesty's Government. He thought the noble Duke deserved the thanks, instead of the hostility, of every portion of the country. His conduct, while in command on the Continent, was such as to entitle him to the lasting praise of his country, and he had no doubt that justice would be done him at last. Even from those who differed from the noble Duke, he should have expected that they would at least have done justice to his good intentions. For himself he did not doubt that the noble Duke felt a self-satisfaction, which more than made up for the dissatisfaction expressed by others; so that he might take to himself the words of the poet:—

> "One self-approving hour whole years outweighs,
> Of stupid starers and of loud huzzas;
> And more true joy Marcellus exil'd feels
> Than Cæsar with a Senate at his heels."

The Duke of *Richmond* said, that at that late hour he would not occupy the time of their Lordships at any length. He rose chiefly to correct what had been said by his noble friend (Earl Stanhope), which no doubt his noble friend himself would regret when he considered the matter. The noble Earl had said, that the committee up-stairs were not inquiring into the condition of the labouring classes, or the cause of their distress. It did not certainly on the first day—the only day, by the way, on which the noble and learned Lord whose Motion was now before the House was present. No doubt that noble and learned Lord had other important avocations which prevented him, and certainly the same avocations would prevent him, from giving any efficient attendance at the two committees, if the one for which he now moved were appointed. On the first day, a noble Lord on the committee objected to entering into any inquiry into the effect of the change of the currency, as going out of the line of inquiry proposed to the committee, which would have quite enough to do without going into that question; but those noble Lords who did attend the committee would bear him out in the statement, and their Lordships would find, on reference to the evidence, that one of the first questions put to every witness was, "Are the labourers in the same condition that they were ten years ago?" The answer, "They are not;" and then came the question, "What, in your opinion, is the cause of the change in their condition?" This, surely, was inquiring into the condition of the labouring poor, and into the cause of the change which had been made in it. He was anxious to set their Lordships and the country right upon this point, to prevent any mistake going abroad that it was not the intention of Government to go into this inquiry. The whole of the case as to the condition of the poor would be gone into, and the committee would come at as much information on the subject as could be obtained by granting the committee for which the noble and learned Lord had moved. He had not risen for the purpose of justifying his own consistency, for he did not think it necessary; but he must say, that he had voted for the committee moved for last session, because at that time he had no confidence in the then Government, which had refused all inquiry, and even denied the existence of the distress to the extent which he knew it to prevail. He did then vote for a full inquiry into the state of the poor, but at that time he stated, that he would not go into the inquiry as to the Corn-laws or the Currency; but the noble Lord would enter fully into both those points. In the present thin state of the House, and at that late hour, he would not enter into a defence of his consistency, or into a defence of the motives which had induced him to join the present Administration; but he challenged any noble Lord to give him the opportunity of justifying himself before their Lordships and the country on this ground.

Earl *Stanhope* in explanation, said, that he had not charged the committee up stairs with not being competent to go through the inquiry into the state of the poor. All he had said was, that their inquiry would not embrace the causes of the distress. What he had said of machinery was, that while he objected to acting from any intimidation, he still considered that the employment of machinery which he considered unnecessary to the country, and injurious to the poor, ought to be got rid of.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* conceived, that by going into the inquiry proposed by the noble and learned Lord, their Lordships would only embarrass themselves, and not obtain the end they had in view in the committee on which some of them were already engaged. One thing he had heard with pleasure from his noble friend (Earl Grey) which was, that on any matter connected with the state of the labouring poor, or the causes of or mode of relief of their distress, his mind was open to conviction. After that statement he would not press the subject on the noble Earl; but he hoped that between this and the meeting after the recess, the Government would consider how far the removal of the credit formerly given by the country banker to the farmer, was a cause of the almost ruin and decay to which so many of the latter class had since fallen. This, he admitted, had nothing to do with the question of general distress, but it was worthy of serious consideration, and would be particularly so when the question of the renewal of the Bank of England charter came to be considered. It was extremely desirable to consider, on that occasion, to what extent it was possible and desirable to introduce the system of chartered banks into this country, the same as in Scotland. By that he thought they would confer the greatest boon that had ever been conferred on the country. He would not press the matter now, but he thought the consideration of it would be of much greater benefit than that of the question of non-interference, of the Game-laws, or any other subject that could be brought forward. He meant to give the motion for the committee his decided negative, because he thought it would tend to defeat its own object. He would wait for well-digested measures—which he hoped from the present Government; but if a long period should intervene without such healing measures as would relieve the agricultural pressure, he should feel it his duty to move, if no other noble Lord did, for a committee, not such as that now moved for, but one which would go into the whole cause of the agricultural distress, because he felt that such inquiry was absolutely necessary. He thought the ills of many years of mismanagement might be easily removed, if they could come at the real cause of those ills.

The Earl of *Darnley* said, he would not have obtruded himself on their Lordships at that hour, if an attack had not been made upon him. He must say, he never had denied the existence of distress. He had only said, that the distress was greatly exaggerated, and that that exaggeration had tended greatly to produce much of the present excitement in the country. He could adduce many instances of this in his own county, where, by the prompt aid of his tenants, the attempts to produce some of those rural insurrections had been speedily checked. After stating that the Magistrates in his part of the country had been extremely active and diligent, he concluded by expressing his great satisfaction at the circular issued by Government to the Magistrates of the country.

Lord *Stourton* said, had I risen earlier in the debate, I should have entered more fully into the subject before your Lordships. But there is one fact, which I must advert to. It was said, that the condition of the manufacturers had only improved since the late troubles in France. I can state, for the satisfaction of the House, that the improvement in our manufactures commenced in the early part of the Spring, and has rather suffered, in consequence of those troubles; which, for a time, has given some check to commercial credit and confidence. I think that the depression of the agricultural interest is not of to-day, or of yesterday; but, that it is hardly possible to put one's finger upon a time, since the last war, when it was prosperous, unless in a period of general excitement such as 1824, when the extraordinary amount of capital expended produced everywhere a feverish and short-lived prosperity. With respect to machinery, I must say, that so far from its being injurious to the country, I think that it is principally owing to machinery being more applicable to manufactures, than to agriculture, that the manufacturers are better able to employ their men, and to meet foreign competition, notwithstanding the heavy incumbrances of the country,—incumbrances which I could undertake to prove, from several distinct and powerful causes, are at this moment heavier, notwithstanding every reduction in taxation, than during the last years of the war. Nor is it very practicable to draw a line, and to say what is new machinery, and what is not: for example, the wheel-barrow, that seems of such easy contrivance as might make it appear of very old date, may be called machinery of the middle ages; having been the invention, as I have been assured, of Pascal, during the reign of Lewis 14th. I have risen also to suggest to Ministers the necessity, if we continue to support a golden currency, of paying the utmost possible attention to the well-being of those Mexican, and other American mines, in the working of which, during the bubble year, so many millions of British capital were expended: and which, amidst all the mad speculations of that gambling period, may have been an exception, as having been expended for the ultimate benefit of the country. For, as the real value of gold and silver, like the value of any other marketable commodity, depends upon the common laws of demand and supply, our real Bank Restriction Act of 1826, which requires such masses of gold to carry it into effect, tends, both here and everywhere else, to increase the real value of gold and silver in the market. Just as the Bank Restriction Act of 1797—which was in reality a Bank-protection Act—tended to lower the real value of gold; for deception was the great character of the Restriction Act of 1797, which, in effect, protected the Bank against demands for gold. I offer this suggestion, because it is most important, now that the demand for gold has so much increased, not only here, but in other countries, that the supply from the mines should be abundant. My motive last year, for refusing my acquiescence in the committee demanded by the noble Duke, who, I am glad to see tendering the aid of his powerful and vigorous mind to the Administration of the country in this critical and trying period, was this: that I thought it was intended to imply some reproach to the noble Duke at the head of his Majesty's Government—whom I considered then (and the events of these times, have only strengthened that conviction) as the "*bis Salvator Patriæ*" by his Relief Bill of 1829. I thought, too, that the reproach was most unseasonable at the moment, when he had just taken off 4,000,000*l.* of taxes, bearing almost exclusively on the labouring classes. For, if the noble Duke had abandoned influence, and surrendered patronage, it was to give his relief bill, for so I understood the Beer bill, to those classes, thereby to afford them a cheaper and more wholesome beverage; and to wipe off at the same time a blot from our Fiscal Statute Book, for so I have always considered the Beer-tax, being a partial and therefore unjust tax, affecting the labouring, more than any other class of society. I also disliked a committee, from its dilatory process, as well as from other considerations: and I was more particularly influenced in refusing my assent to it, by the knowledge that the Premier had just assented to a committee in the Lower House, to inquire into the state of the poor in Ireland, which I regarded as likely to offer the most effectual means of probing the real evil to the bottom,—an evil which will be found mainly to consist, as I stated on a former night, in the surplus labour produced by the unemployed poor, and cheap labour of Ireland. Upon some similar grounds, and as embracing a still wider field of inquiry. I dissent from the present Motion.

Lord *Wynford* replied. He had been represented by the noble Lord (King) as having spoken against the Press, but he had done no such thing; what he said was, that he regretted that so powerful an instrument as the public Press, which he admitted was now very ably conducted, should occasionally give currency to opinions which he considered as very injurious. But when he expressed that opinion, he made no attack on the Press, any more than he made an attack on any of their Lordships when he combatted their opinions. He should be very sorry that any such statement should go uncontradicted. He wished also to reply to the statement of the noble Duke, for whom he had a very high respect (Richmond), who had inquired why he had not been present at his motion for a committee last year, that he was then attending the administration of justice in the House, and had not strength to attend twice a day. It was asserted by the noble Duke, that the inquiry now proposed was so extensive as to reach far beyond the bounds within which it would be possible to bring it to a conclusion. He begged leave to say, if that were the case, it was in the power of noble Lords to narrow it; and it might be limited, as had been suggested, to an inquiry into the causes of the distress of agriculture, to which he verily believed all other distress might be attributed. Unless noble Lords said all inquiries were unnecessary, and it was generally admitted that some inquiry was demanded, they ought either to consent to his Motion, limiting it to suit their views, or they ought to shew that no inquiry whatever was necessary. He had felt it his duty to make the Motion, in order to bring the subject under the public view. The noble Earl (Grey) said, that he had brought forward a novel scheme, and proposed to inquire into the abuse of machinery. But if that were a novel scheme of inquiry, the merit of originating it did not belong to him. In the last Session of Parliament, the noble Duke then at the head of the Government stated, that the effects of machinery were fit and proper subjects for inquiry. In the Speech from the Throne an inquiry was recommended, and it was stated, that an inquiry into the effect of the use of steam-engines and of machinery, in throwing the labourer out of employment, was then contemplated by the late Ministers. For his part he had said nothing against the use of machinery, but only against its abuse, and all things, even the most useful, were liable to abuse. He had no wish to restrain invention, no wish to put fetters on the human intellect; but he thought it was a proper subject for inquiry, to ascertain what effect the continual extension of the use of machinery had over the interest of that class whom, above all others, it was their Lordships' duty to protect. He considered that the interest of the labourers should be sacred in their Lordships' eyes. Such an inquiry might show the people their error, and prevent them from pursuing that course which had led to the present disturbances. The noble Earl (Grey) had also accused him of wishing to do a more absurd thing —to regulate anew all family settlements. But with all possible respect to the noble Earl, he had never meant to do anything so absurd. What he said had been borne out by the statement of the noble Earl above him, which was, that they ought not to compel family settlements, made in money of a different value from the present, and when rents were very different from their amount now, to be paid in the present money, when rents were so much reduced; those settlements, he must say, gave opulence to the junior branches of families, while they ruined the elder branches, who had to support all the honours, and perform all the duties of their station. He did not wish to alter those settlements, but he did wish to try if agriculture could not be brought back to something near the style it was when these settlements were made. He was anxious that it should not go abroad that he had proposed anything so absurd as that attributed to him by the noble Earl. In making his Motion, he was not influenced by any wish to place the Ministers in a situation of difficulty. When the Ministers found the country in a state of difficulty, he should be most wicked if, from any factious views, or any opposition, he added to their difficulty. He was ready to give the Government all the support in his power, and whoever should now oppose it from factious motives, would be guilty of a crime of no small magnitude. God forbid that he should do that! He had no such wish when he made his Motion. In justice to himself, he must state the circumstances which gave occasion to it. The noble Earl at the head of the Government stated some time back, that Ministers intended to apply themselves to the consideration of the distress. On hearing this, he determined, that before the Ministers were installed into their office, as the noble Earl expressed it, he would not bring forward his Motion, which he had long contemplated. He had waited then till he had an opportunity of asking the noble Earl, whether he intended to do anything, for what the noble Earl had said would produce a temporary good effect, but that would soon wear off if nothing further were done; and understanding that the noble Earl intended to do nothing, he then gave notice of his Motion for a distant day, saying, that he hoped the Government, or some more influential Peer, would feel it his duty to bring the subject forward, and save him the trouble. The noble Earl wished him to withdraw his Motion before giving any reason for it. To that he could not consent; and if nothing more had been said, he would have divided the House on the question, though he should have gone below the bar himself. He was convinced, indeed, that if the Ministers did not undertake the inquiry, inquiry would be forced on them at some future, and no distant day. It would be necessary, he believed, to go into an inquiry, in order to secure the peace of the country. He was persuaded, indeed, that the strong arm of the law, firmly wielded, as he was sure it would be by the noble Lord, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and assisted as he would be by the magistracy of the country, would be sufficient to put an end to the tumults which at present disgraced and troubled us; but if the cause of those tumults was not removed —though God forbid that he should say anything to palsy the arm of the law— but if the cause was not removed, vain, very vain would it be to cut off a few offenders, whose offences, he granted, were great, but vain would it be to cut off those offenders, if no measures were taken to remedy the distress. The noble Earl had, in the course of the debate, stated, that it was the intention of his Majesty's Government to consider the subject, and he knew that it could not be in better hands. He confided in them. As the noble Earl had stated that, he should, with the permission of their Lordships, withdraw his Motion.

Earl *Grey* stated, that the noble Lord must surely remember that he had stated, as soon as he had been appointed to Office, that his Majesty's Government would apply themselves to consider the state of the country. The first opportunity he had had, he had stated that his Majesty's Ministers would do so, and that he considered it not less their interest than their duty. Did the noble Lord think that they were so negligent or so ignorant of their duty, as not to know that their first attention ought to be directed to the most serious evils that ever a Ministry had to encounter?

Lord *Wynford* agreed that the noble Earl had made that explanation.

The Earl of *Rosslyn* wished, in the absence of the noble Duke lately at the head of the Administration, to correct a misrepresentation of the noble Lord with regard to what had fallen from that noble Duke in a former Session of Parliament. He did not wish it to go forth to the public that the noble Duke, then at the head of his Majesty's Government, had said, that he was satisfied that machinery was productive of mischief, and tended to impoverish the people. He was sure that the noble Duke never said any such thing, or anything like it. He was sure that his Majesty's Ministers were not of opinion that machinery was the cause of distress, or produced any want of employment.

Lord *Wynford* wished it to be understood, that he had not intentionally misrepresented any man, but certainly he had understood the noble Duke to say, that the influence of machinery, in depriving the manual labourer of employment, was a subject worthy of being inquired into, and was a subject beyond the control of the Legislature.

The Duke of *Richmond* wished to correct another mis-statement of the noble Lord. He had said, that a noble Earl, not then in his place (Roseberry) had attributed all the disturbance to the education of the people. Nobody said so—nobody would dare to say so. What the noble Earl said, was, he believed—that it was more imperative on their Lordships than ever, to show some sympathy for the distresses of the people, for their better education made them more alive than formerly to sympathy or to neglect.

The Motion negatived without a division.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, Dec. 9.

MINUTES.] New Writs. For the Borough of Newport, in the room of Mr. DOHERTY, who had accepted the Chiltern Hundreds:—For the Borough of St. Germains, in the room of the right hon. Sir H. HARDINGE, who had accepted the Chiltern Hundreds.

The Committee appointed to try the merits of the Petition of Herbert Baldwin, esq., of the City of Cork, complaining of an undue Return and Election for that City, reported Mr. DANIEL O'CALLAGHAN duly elected; and that neither the Petition nor the opposition thereto was vexatious or frivolous.

Petitions presented. Against Slavery, by Sir J. OWEN, from the Methodists and other Congregations in various parts of the County of Brecon:—By Mr. KEMP, from a Parish in Sussex:—By Mr. W. PATTEN, from Mile-end-street Chapel, Liverpool, and from different parts of Lancashire:—By Mr. J. WOOD, five from places in Lancashire:—By Mr. EVANS, three from places in Derbyshire:—By Mr. ROBARTS, from Maudstone:—By Mr. PONSONBY, from Wimborne. By Mr. HODGES, from George Gunning, for an amendment of the Law regulating the Duties of Parochial Officers. By Mr. BUCKE, from Biddeford and Exeter, praying for a Repeal of the Duty on Coals; also from Exeter, against Hawkers and Pedlars. By Sir W. INGILBY, from Wm. Cobbett, for the repeal of the Assessed Taxes and Tithes. By Mr. O'GORMAN MAHON, from Drumline, county Clare, against assessing Catholics to pay Rates for Protestant Churches. By Mr. O'CONNELL, from W. S. Smith, a Chelsea pensioner, complaining of the stoppage of 5 per Cent out of the Chelsea Pension, and praying relief; from J. Thompson, the son of a freeman of Clonmell, complaining that he was unable to take out his Freedom, in consequence of the great expense; praying for Legislative Relief, from 105 Labourers, who had been driven, under the Subletting Act, from the neighbourhood of Tankerstown, in the County of Limerick; from the Inhabitants of Ardragoole, and three other places, for the Repeal of the Subletting Act; from Whitechurch, for the establishment of Poor-laws in Ireland; from the five Catholic Clergymen who had charge of the Chapel of Navan, in the County of Meath, against the Vestry Act; for a Reform in Parliament, from Ayr, and from two Societies of Friends to Reform, meeting at the Rotunda, Blackfriars road; from the Trades of Dublin, and from places in the Counties of Waterford, Kilkenny, Meath, Galway, and Dublin, for the Repeal of the Union; and from the Gentlemen of the Irish Bar, practising on the Galway Circuit, for an extension of the Elective Franchise in that Town. By Mr. J. WOOD, from Roscommon, for placing the Catholics and Protestants on the same footing in Corporate Towns as to the Elective Franchise; from Blackburn, for the Repeal of the Stamp Duties on Newspapers; and for Church Reform, from the Rev. T. Spencer.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.] Mr. *O'Connell* presented a Petition from the parish of St. Michael, North Petherstone, in favour of Parliamentary Reform. The petitioners wished that Rotten Boroughs should be entirely done away, and he contended that no reform would be completed which left one rotten borough in the country, and which did not introduce ballot.

The Marquis of *Blandford* seized the opportunity to express his great regret at the language which had been used by his Majesty's new Minister upon the subject of Parliamentary Reform—language which, though, perhaps, more prudent, was, to his mind, nearly as disheartening as was the language of his immediate predecessor. The great reformer of 1793, the man who laid upon the Table of that House that ever-memorable petition, which had been quoted with his name, as its author, ten thousand times all over the country—was it possible that he could have said this question now required much time and deliberation, particularly after declaring that he never would support the principles of universal suffrage—in which determination he (Lord Blandford) entirely agreed with him—and that he wished to stand as much as he could upon the settled institutions of his country, in which desire he also most fully concurred. How, then, could the Minister at the same time say that the task was one of no slight difficulty now. Then the close and rotten boroughs were to be extinguished and annihilated for ever. Had the Constitution been unlearnt since that time? Were the disciples of this great master now to be told that he had not yet made up his mind upon the subject, that he could only talk "generally" upon that which used to be considered as his favourite hobby—that delay was necessary—that great consideration was necessary—and that the whole question was surrounded with no small difficulty? If the close and rotten boroughs were to be preserved, or if any of them were to be kept, then he (Lord Blandford) could understand how the question was full of difficulty. But if the principles of the petition of the friends of the people in 1793 were to be adhered to, and none short of these will, or ought to, satisfy the country—then he could see no difficulty in the matter, no cause for delay, which must be dangerous in the present momentous state of the kingdom. It was for these considerations that he did feel it to be his first and paramount duty to appear in his place last Tuesday evening, with the intention of lending his feeble support to the motion of the hon.

and learned Member for Waterford. He regretted exceedingly that the hon. Member had abandoned the field to others—the more so when he called to mind the character of the proceedings of the committee on the Calne election; and when he reflected upon occurrences of a similar character at the election which had just taken place at Knaresborough. He would confess, that the unfortunate proceedings connected with these two boroughs under Whig domination were sufficient to excite in his mind considerable distrust and apprehension that the reform which was promised would ultimately prove far from satisfactory to the country. Reform, very extensive reform, was loudly called for, and must be conceded to the public voice. The delay of a single day was dangerous. With the delay would increase the demands. That which would have satisfied the country twelve months ago, had it been conceded, would not satisfy it now. What would satisfy the people this day would not satisfy them a month hence. There were two measures which appeared to him to require instant adoption, for the security of the country and its best interests. The first—reform, immediate, extensive, radical; the second, the no less speedy reduction of all payments and salaries to the scale of 1792. These payments had all been raised in consequence of the depreciation in the value of money. Now, when that money had been most fraudulently, ruinously, and, he would maintain, treasonably, raised to its former value, all payments and salaries—ay, and every other monied obligation of the country, must be reduced to their former value. If these things were not done, and that speedily, he would tell the present Ministers (from whom he really wished to hope for many measures of great reform and retrenchment, and towards whom, in making this declaration, he was not animated by any feelings of hostility)—he would tell them, nevertheless, that if these things were not done without delay, the country would be lost, the Crown would not be safe upon their Royal master's head, and they themselves would be implicated in the treason.

Mr. *O'Connell,* on presenting three other petitions in favour of reform, said, that he considered the project of reform which had been contemplated by the learned Lord, to whom the noble Marquis (Blandford) alluded, was not sufficient. He thought that men, and not houses, ought to be represented in the Commons House of Parliament. Although he (Mr. O'Connell) hoped that the Government would of itself bring forward some measure of reform, yet he would then give notice, that, if it did not immediately, he would bring forward a motion on the subject three days before the vacation. But should Ministers themselves propose any measure, which would not be a mere delusion, but which would be calculated to give the House its true character, as really representing the people, and honestly watching over their interests, he would support them to the utmost of his ability. If the subject should be longer delayed by Government, he would bring on his motion and divide the House, if he had no other support than that of the noble Lord who had last spoken. It was unnatural that the money of the people should be voted away in a House, the majority of which was nominated by the House of Lords. By no means without the ballot was it possible to prevent that nomination in the present state of these countries; and he could not believe that mode of voting would be opposed by any man but by those who desired to maintain the influence of the aristocracy over the votes of the people.

Sir *Robert Wilson* said, he felt it imperative upon him to contradict the assertion of the hon. and learned Member who had imputed bad motives to all who did not profess to hold the same opinions with himself. The learned Gentleman had chosen to denounce as insincere and dishonest the avowed opinions of men whose whole public lives had proved their integrity to be quite equal to that of the member for Waterford himself. The ballot was opposed by Gentlemen who had come into that House with the sanction of their constituents for that opposition. In the House they did no more than maintain the opinions which they had professed out of it. It was well known, that in the United States of America the ballot had proved to be a deception—a cloak—and encouragement to corruption. By the privacy which it secured, it induced men to sell their votes. The most honourable men had pronounced the ballot to be fallacious and injurious; and, at this moment, there was more fraud practised in those States of America in which the votes were concealed by ballot, than in those in which they were given openly. When the New States of Mexico were about to institute a Republic, and some of their wisest and best patriots deliberated upon the best mode of taking votes, the ballot was rejected. When the hon. and learned Member ventured to impugn the integrity of men as honourable as himself, and as attached to liberty, he arrogated to himself a license to which he had no title. For his part, he (Sir R. Wilson) had, he believed, throughout his life, done quite as much as the learned Gentleman for the advancement of freedom; and he, therefore, could not suffer such accusations, which applied to him, to pass unanswered. While he had the honour of a seat in that House, he would not allow any Gentleman's reproaches to daunt him, nor would he suffer any man to direct him in the discharge of his duty. He would be influenced only by a conscientious regard for the interests of his constituents.

Mr. *Cresset Pelham* wished the question of the ballot to be fairly discussed. As yet he had heard in that House no cogent argument against it; but he did not say that his own opinion respecting it was decided. The times would admit of no delay in the consideration of Reform, and he hoped, that if the Gentlemen on the other side of the House did not bring that subject forward, the Gentlemen below him (on the Opposition Benches) would do so. At the same time he was quite willing to allow for due deliberation before they resolved upon the measure to be proposed.

Mr. *Ruthven* said, that in his judgment, the member for Waterford (Mr. O'Connell) had expressed himself on that evening with a moderation which it would do him honour to observe more generally, both in that House and in Ireland. He was sorry to see him often misapply the great talents which he was well known to possess; but he (Mr. Ruthven) was of opinion, that on that evening an unbecoming violence had been exhibited, in the reply which had been a few minutes ago made to some remarks of that hon. and learned Gentleman. No man in that House differed more widely than he did from some of the opinions of the member for Waterford. But still he would say, that the hon. and learned Gentleman had not said anything which ought to be considered offensive.—[*Sir R. Wilson:* He did].—He (Mr. Ruthven) did not hear a word from him that could offend any man: but he did hear a violent speech from an hon. and gallant Member, which seemed to him (Mr. Ruthven) quite uncalled for. The hon. and gallant Member had made up his mind with sufficient decision respecting the ballot; and to him (Mr. Ruthven) it was matter of surprise the gallant General had not made up his mind on a subject of great importance to his constituents, which had been a few evenings since discussed in that House—he meant the Civil List. He would not have it imagined that he doubted the honour of those Gentlemen, who, now sitting opposite, had voted in support of the late Administration. He was sure that their motives were honourable, and that they voted conscientiously. He wished men who had a duty to perform to those who sent them into that House to come forward and vote as they thought right on such important questions: and he had no doubt that the gallant Member would explain to the satisfaction of his constituents, why, on the discussion of the Civil List, he had been absent. Although he thought, that the ballot would afford to voters a protection of which they stood in need, yet he was prepared to confide in the present Ministers, and he doubted not that they would redeem their pledge on the subject of Reform.

Mr. *Grove Price* supported the petition, and expressed his regret that the learned Lord, of whose talents that House had lately been deprived, had not taken an opportunity of bringing forward a Motion on the subject. He regretted too that the hon. and learned Member for Waterford had not brought forward his motion, for though he differed in many particulars form the learned Lord, and the hon. and learned Member, he was satisfied that the time was come when the question of Reform must be set at rest by conceding it.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that as he had seen the hon. and gallant Officer, who had been for a long time, he believed, member for Southwark, go out of the House before he (Mr. O'Connell) had an opportunity of replying to the remarks made upon him by that gallant Member, he waited until the last moment on the question before the House, in expectation of his return. As the gallant Officer did not return, he would, in his absence say a very few words on the subject. He should not imitate the speech of the gallant Officer, because it was characterised by a temper which he wished to avoid, and by great lack of argument. He denied, that he had said anything to provoke such an attack. He had certainly said, that those who opposed the ballot did so from a desire to maintain an influence over the votes of the people. He would ask, did the gallant Member mean to assert that those who desire to influence voters are dishonourable men? Was it not the fact, that men of the highest character in the country defended such influence on the part of the aristocracy, and insisted that it was indispensable to the well-being of the country. He did not feel himself called on to answer the speech of the gallant Member. His speech contained no one argument. What was meant by the assertion that the ballot was un-English? Was it to be called un-English because it would put it out of the power of any man to say to a tradesman, in soliciting his vote, "Unless you vote for me, you shall lose the custom of twenty families?" Was it un-English because it would at once remove the cruel and ambitious landlord from the temptation to punish the children of the voter for the honesty of their father, and drive whole families houseless upon the world? He (Mr. O'Connell) need not boast of what he had done for his country. He would let his acts speak for him. But he would say, that when the hon. and gallant General should have done for his country as much good as he might, without boasting, say he had done for Ireland, he would listen to his taunts without displeasure. Had he said anything which could reasonably offend, he would most willingly retract it. The cause of those who opposed the ballot could derive no benefit from such aid as the gallant Officer had offered to it; and it was needless for him to say more in refutation of a speech in which he had been so unprovokedly attacked.

Petition laid on the Table.

Repeal of the Union—Personalities.] *O'Gorman Mahon* said, that the Petition which he had the honour to present, was that of the inhabitants of Clondegad, in the county of Clare, praying that the Act of Union of Great Britain and Ireland be rescinded, and attributing to that measure the deep distress which at present prevailed in every part of Ireland. In moving that the petition be brought up, he would throw himself on the indulgence of the House whilst he said a few words respecting a matter in which he was personally concerned. In such a case he would not occupy the House, if it were not one in which all the Members were equally interested with himself. For if a system of calumny and misrepresentation out of doors were not at once put down by exposure in that House, no hon. Member could defend himself against such attacks. If any man came forward in a bold and straightforward manner to impugn his conduct, he would cheerfully endeavour to satisfy him. As that was the first time he had had the honour of addressing the House, he hoped for that lenity which was usually conceded to new Members, and which, in his peculiar case, would be more especially needed, as he should feel himself under the necessity of trespassing upon their patience and indulgence at greater length than was customary upon the presentation of a petition, having to vindicate himself from a charge under which no Member of that House could permit his character to rest. As the circumstances to which he should find it necessary to advert involved a very heavy personal charge, he hoped, as a boon, that a hearing might be granted him, which, under different circumstances, he might claim under another denomination. The injurious attack upon his character to which he alluded, and which injured him both as a public and as a private individual, had been carried on under the mask of secret correspondence—a mode of attack, he was happy to think, as little recognised by the laws of that House as it was by the usages of respectable society out of doors. Though he might not be prepared to name the person who had been guilty of that false and scandalous attack upon his reputation, yet he was able to proceed thus far:—He was able to affirm, that a Member of that House was the guilty individual. He therefore trusted, that, as his place in Parliament was the proper situation from which a Member of that House should defend himself, the House would at least feel he was asking it to do no more than extend to him that indulgence which was due to a man who came fairly, openly, and above-board, to protect himself from charges dishonourable to those who preferred them, and deeply degrading to any man who could silently submit to the imputations they conveyed. Yet, notwithstanding all this, he should scarcely feel himself justified in addressing them at the length he intended, were it not that what he had to say involved an important principle, and one which interested every hon. Gentleman in that House. That of which he had to complain was put forth by means of ambiguous insinuations—put forth to the public through the medium of the newspapers. He felt that some apology was due to that House for seeking to make it the means of repelling an attack made outside its walls, but when it was recollected that he could—as he pledged himself he could—establish at that bar, by the most irrefragable proofs, that the correspondence in question proceeded, and could proceed from no one but a Member of that House, it was upon that ground chiefly that the sympathy, he hoped, would be extended to him, which, in similar circumstances, he should be most proud and happy to extend to others who might have occasion to rebut charges most false and injurious, or to vindicate their characters from imputations the most unworthy and discreditable. Besides those he had mentioned—any one of which would have been more than sufficient to plead his justification for trespassing upon the indulgence of the House—he could not but recollect that he was there, not alone the guardian of his personal rights, or to vindicate his private reputation—he stood there as the Representative of a great county, and that he should ill discharge the duty he owed to the constituents who sent him there, did he not repel with indignation the charges which had been conveyed through the channels to which he alluded. It had been charged against him, that upon a late important occasion there was some portion of his conduct which had been governed by the influence of the then existing Administration—that, in a word, he had been guided by the Treasury influence of the late Administration. That was a sort of charge to meet which it behoved him, not merely as an individual—not alone as the Representative of a great county, but for the sake of the other Members of that House; and it was therefore in an especial degree that he claimed their indulgence. He would repeat, too, that that was the proper place for him to do it, seeing that he had no alternative but to adopt that course, or engage in a paper war. Having premised thus much, and having stated generally the nature of the accusation which he had to meet, he would call upon the Member in question to get up in his place to repeat the allegation referred to, and bring forward proofs, if any he possessed. He defied that Member to the proof—he defied him to show that the charge was not a gross, deliberate, wilful falsehood. As he felt that the rules of that House did not permit him there to impute deliberate and wilful falsehood to any Member, yet he had not been prevented from contradicting it in another place, and in a different form. Now, as that Member had been apprised that such language was applied to him if he disregarded the opportunity which the present occasion afforded him of standing up in his place to defend himself, that Member must feel that he stood in a very invidious situation. [*cries of "name, name!"*] He came there for the express purpose of bringing the name, and, if possible, the man before them. [*laughter, and cries of "Order."*]

Mr. *Warburton* said, it was equally out of order for the hon. Member to allude to disorderly language spoken or written by him out of doors, as if it were actually uttered within the walls of that House. To adopt that which was out of order, was tantamount to a breach of order.

O'Gorman Mahon resumed:—He was perfectly ready to receive instructions from any hon. Member as to the observance of order in that House; he was, as they all must know, utterly inexperienced in the forms of the House, but he begged to call attention to this, that he had not there said a Member had resorted to a deliberate and wilful falsehood; he merely stated the fact, that he had so written out of doors, and he had no difficulty in asserting, that the Member alluded to would be acting a most pusillanimous part if he did not instantly avow himself in that House as the author of the publication complained of. Surely he was not out of order in referring to what occurred elsewhere, when he did not repeat it in the House in a disorderly form. He merely stated that strong declaration of falsehood as to the charge made against him of lending himself to the views of the Duke of Wellington's Government. In speaking of that Government, then, he could not be open to any accusation of devoting himself to the interests of a Minister. The noble Duke and his friends were now out of office. Those honorable and right honorable Gentlemen were now no longer at the side of the House from which he then spoke. He could not, then, be accused of being under Treasury influence, when he tendered to the noble Duke, on his own behalf, and on behalf of the Catholic gentry of Ireland and of England, the warmest expressions of his gratitude for the boon of emancipation conferred on his country, by the prevention of civil war. He made that assertion then for the purpose of more effectually branding with his contempt the charge brought against him. He had not the slightest hesitation in saying, that the Duke of Wellington had conferred a deep obligation upon men of all parties; but he begged to add to that assertion, that he never received any proposition from that Ministry, or any member of it, or any one having the remotest connection with it. He regretted exceedingly that the noble Duke had not, at the commencement of the Session, made up his mind to those measures which, being expected from the present Administration, procured for them his most hearty and cordial support. He deeply regretted that the noble Duke had not enabled himself and other independent and liberal Members to rally round the late Administration. He still more regretted that, as a Catholic, he was not enabled to demonstrate his gratitude by supporting the Administration that conferred upon the empire the great boon which entitled him to a seat in that House. He was no seeker after pensions or emoluments—he was no place-hunter—he merely stood up in that House to defend his own character, his rights as a Member of Parliament, the rights of his constituents, and, finally, to express his gratitude to the head of the late Government, to whom he unhesitatingly said, that both England and Ireland were deeply indebted. He was proud to avow himself an old Agitator—he knew the state of Ireland, and he had not the slightest difficulty in affirming, that the great measure of the late Government saved the country from civil war. Yes, he was an old Agitator, because he felt deeply the disabilities under which his brethren and himself laboured. Many a time had he sat below that bar, pining under the ineligibility which excluded him from coming above it, though no act of his, or of his country, had rendered him unworthy of that honour. There was no stain on them as a body or as individuals, and all they prayed for was eligibility; the Duke of Wellington saved the country at a critical moment, and for that great act the noble Duke had won his warmest gratitude. He was no professional man—he was no barrister, lawyer, or attorney; he came there as an honest man, representing worthy constituents, to speak what he knew of his own knowledge, and give utterance to those feelings which any right-minded man in the country must entertain. Had the great boon of emancipation been deferred, what could have saved Ireland from the horrors of civil war, with the example of France before her eyes rescued in three days, and, added to that, the example of Belgium? Subsidised, as the Irish were from America, and with examples like those on the Continent before them, what but the great measure of the noble Duke could have saved the country, especially when England herself was in a flame? Had the measure been delayed, Ireland, instead of accepting it as a boon, would have thundered at their gates and enforced it as a right. In such an event, emancipation would have been thanklessly extorted, instead of having been gratefully received as a boon, proceeding as it did, from a sense of justice and expediency. No man who was acquainted with the state of parties but must know, that if the noble Duke had not thrown himself into the scale against the Church, against the Borough-mongers, and the great anti-Catholic party in England, the measure could never have been carried. For that he felt deeply grateful to the noble Duke. Neither could he forget what was due to the right hon. Baronet who formerly represented the University of Oxford, than which a more distinguished object of ambition no man could propose to himself. He happened to have been at Oxford during the election which immediately followed upon the resignation of that right hon. Baronet, when the streets were literally blackened with the crowds of persons who came up to oppose him; and who evinced, in the manner of registering their hostility, little of that Christian charity to which they laid claim—little of that gratitude which was due from the Ministers of a peaceful religion—to him who had saved the country from anarchy and blood, and established in their room amity and concord. Having always expressed those sentiments in private, he found himself all of a sudden assailed; and for no better reason than because he had not concealed them, he was to be taunted with being a Ministerial tool—with being a creature of the Treasury-bench. He was as independent of the noble Duke and the right hon. Baronet as they could possibly be of him; he was no pension-seeker and place-hunter; and while it rested with an anonymous pamphleteer to utter a deliberate—the unparliamentary phrase was always coming uppermost to his lips [*a laugh and cheers*]—had he not a right to complain of having his character attacked by those who were afraid to come forward and utter these charges in open day. It was a great injury to him thus to have his character filched away secretly, instead of men coming forward openly and fairly to state what they had to say. He would now, with the permission of the House, advert to one circumstance which gave something like a plausible pretext for what had been urged against him. The first vote of consequence which had been given in that House since he had the honour of a seat in it, was on the Civil List—that he had not voted on the popular side upon that question was entirely owing to his having been shut out. He was in that House till nine o'clock at night—he sat between the Hon. member for Middlesex and the hon. member for Westminster, Mr. Hobhouse and Mr. Hume [*cries of* "*Order.*"] Between two such tutelary deities, it was scarcely to be supposed that he would have gone astray—it was scarcely to have been supposed that, sitting in such company, and at that side of the House, he could have supported the Duke of Wellington without being open to the charge of most arrant hypocrisy. He had been for many hours without tasting food. He asked the hon. member for Middlesex when he expected that the division would come on? The reply was, that the debate would continue for several hours yet to come. He left the House, and was back in forty minutes, but that short time sufficed to exclude him from the division. Thus it happened that he did not vote with the majority on that memorable occasion. So the fact turned out, and as it happened, he rejoiced that in the first political act of his life he was prevented, though without any previous intention on his part, from being accessory to a vote which proved fatal to the Government of that Minister to whom his country owed so much, and whose great measure had emancipated him and his brethren. He was sincerely glad that the matter had so occurred, merely as a gratification to his own individual feelings; but at the same time he claimed no credit to himself for the event; as it was not affected by any conduct of his. He would not much further obtrude himself upon the attention of the House, but he should ill discharge the duty he owed to them, as well as to his own sense of truth and justice, did he not, after what had fallen from him, state, that there was one Member of the House to whom his observations could not apply. He had the authority of a letter, which was not to be questioned, for stating, that there was one Member of that House who had exculpated himself from any connection with the charge in question. He had authority for stating, that he would be the last to indulge in the propagation of a calumny so utterly unworthy of any Gentleman—so wholly removed from all that could constitute the line of conduct which a Gentleman would propose to himself. The Member whom he thus wished to exempt was the hon. and learned member for Waterford, who, as he had denied the charge, he felt bound to exempt. That hon. and learned Member had come to a resolution well known to that House, and having adopted such a determination, he could not think of uttering any disrespectful epithet with reference to him. That hon. and learned Member had taken a trouble which he himself would not have taken—that of rescuing him from the charge by means of the very same medium through which it had been originally preferred. It had not been his lot to have exchanged one hundred words with that hon. and learned Gentleman during the last sixteen or eighteen months, but though he thus, upon the authority of the hon. and learned Gentleman's own denial, felt bound to exempt him from the charge, yet there did remain one Member of that House to whom his observations did fully apply, and that he begged to state openly and fairly, calling upon that Member to come forward and relieve himself from the imputation of giving rise to such a calumny as that which had been made the subject of his present observations. He would appeal to the tenor of his own short career, while he had the honour of a seat in that House, whether he had not been consistent, and whether he had not acted and voted in conformity with the principles which he professed? Antecedently to their coming into Office, he voted generally with those who were now the confidential advisers of the Crown. There was no ambiguity in any part of his conduct; he supported measures, not men; and the present Administration should have whatever benefit was derivable from the full confidence which he felt in them, until they should prove themselves unworthy of it by a departure from their public professions. He supported them for the liberal sentiments which had always marked the course of their public lives; he supported them as the friends of reform, retrenchment, and, above all, he supported them as maintaining the great principle in foreign policy of non-interference. Here, then, he would take his stand, and he felt gratified at being able to avail himself of that opportunity, at an early period, of expressing the confidence which he felt in the present advisers of the Crown, amongst whom he recognised the old, staunch, and consistent advocates of liberal principles. Amidst them it would be invidious to particularize; yet there was one name which he never could omit mentioning with that affection which was so justly accorded to it by all classes —he meant the venerable and beloved Bishop of Norwich. He trusted that in proceeding thus far he had not transgressed the bounds which the usages of the House set to observations made under circumstances such as his. He would, in conclusion, declare his determination to co-operate most cordially with the present Government so long as their conduct should agree with their past professions.

Petition read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

GRAND JURIES (IRELAND).] Sir *John Newport* rose, he said, pursuant to the notice he had given, to move several resolutions on the subject of Grand Juries in Ireland, and expressed his regret that the subject had not been taken up by some Member who could do it much more justice than was in his power. No man was more fully impressed with the great importance of this subject to Ireland, and with the necessity that some alteration should be made in the present Grand Jury system of that country; at the same time he felt that he had not strength sufficient to undertake the task of attempting that reform in the system which he knew to be necessary. He had, however, great satisfaction in knowing that the Government was fully impressed with the great importance of the local taxation of Ireland, and was disposed to do all in its power to remove the evils complained of. He had, therefore, the less repugnance to bring forward the subject in the absence of the right hon. the Secretary for Ireland, and were he to wait until that right hon. Gentleman should have taken his seat, it would carry the Motion much beyond that time at which it ought to be submitted to Parliament. The great importance of this subject, and the necessity of reforming the present system, had been both admitted by a Committee of that House. In the Report on the State of the Poor in Ireland, printed by order of the House in July, it was stated:—

> "The Grand Juries of Ireland assembled at the Spring and Summer Assizes, in addition to their criminal functions, are intrusted with the entire civil administration of county expenditure. They levy the funds from whence the salaries of public officers, the expense of prisons, bridewells, and police are defrayed —they supply funds for the hospitals, infirmaries, lunatic asylums, and dispensaries— they decide upon making and repairing roads and bridges—they audit the accounts of all past expenditure under these several heads. Thus, the Grand Juries in Ireland are not only charged with the duties performed by the Grand Juries in England, but, in addition, exercise functions performed in this part of the empire by Magistrates at Quarter Sessions, and are intrusted with Powers reserved under the English system for the Legislature only. The Grand Juries decide what works shall be undertaken—the price at which such works shall be executed—and the individuals who shall become responsible for their completion. The taxation levied for these various purposes, is raised from the actual occupiers of the land, and by collectors, who are armed with the summary power of distress and sale. At various times the subject of Grand Jury presentments has been considered, both in the House and in Select Committees. In 1815, 1816, and 1822, inquiries have been instituted from which some remedial measures have originated, but as the reports of both Houses of Parliament in 1825 specially directed the attention of the Legislature to the state of the Grand Jury laws, and as a further report was made to the same effect in 1827, your Committee feel justified in assuming that there is still an admitted necessity for a more effectual reform than has been yet applied to correct the acknowledged imperfections and abuses of the present system."

After this acknowledgement of a Select

Committee of the House, it was hardly necessary for him to take up any time in proving that some reform of the system was required. He should, therefore, only point out some parts of the system which, more than others, called for the immediate interposition of the Legislature. It appeared from returns which had been laid on the Table of the House, that the amount levied by Grand Juries in Ireland in 1810, was 607,000*l.*; in 1821, 755,000*l.*; in 1825, 843,000*l.*; in 1829, 845,000*l.*, and upwards. Thus the sums levied in about twenty years had increased upwards of 200,000*l.*, and such an immense amount of local taxation in a country like Ireland, called for the most serious attention of Parliament; more particularly as the whole of this revenue was raised and expended without any control whatever being exercised over it by those on whom the heaviest portion of the burthen fell. The powers of Grand Juries were originally confined to levies of rates for repairs of roads and bridges; gradually, however, they were extended to other objects, the expense of which ought properly to be borne not by the tenant or temporary occupant of the land, but by its permanent holders. The whole burthen, however, fell upon the tenant—who was not allowed to exercise any control whatever either in originating the tax or in directing its expenditure. It was a curious fact and well worth the consideration of the House, that a magistrate who had not the power to direct any expense in the county exceeding 40*s.* in amount, must possess a qualification of 100*l.* a-year in land—while a Grand Juror, to whose power of taxation there was scarcely any limit, need possess no higher qualification than a freehold of the value of 40*s.* A remedy for the defect in this part of the system might be found by altering that clause in the Act which directed the Sheriff to return the grand panel of the county. By that Act the Sheriff was directed to make, at Michaelmas, a return of persons possessed of freeholds of at least 40*s.* in value, to form the grand panel, and if the qualifications for a grand juror were raised from 40*s.* to 200*l.* in land, it would have the effect of getting a set of men as grand jurors, whose interest it would be, not to tax the county in any case but one of necessity. One great objection to the present system of taxation, was its inequality--the occupier of bad land being rated just the same according to the extent of ground, as the occupier of good land, and on this principle twenty-three men had authority to tax the county to an almost unlimited extent. He had reason to believe that it was the intention of Government to take some steps to remedy this evil, and the late Secretary for Ireland undertook to bring in a bill to regulate Grand Jury assessments. Whether the same measure was to be adopted by the present Government he knew not, but he hoped the remedy would be on an extensive scale. The present system was defective in almost every part, and could not be remedied by any very light measures. The reform ought to be sweeping and extensive. Believing that several other Members wished to address the House on this subject, who were much more able to do so than he was, he would then submit his resolutions, in the hope that the House would adopt them as the basis of the remedies it might be disposed to apply. He would first move that the Report from the Select Committee on the state of the poor in Ireland, presented the 16th of July this year, being a summary of the first, second, and third reports of the evidence taken before that Committee, be entered as read; which being done, the right hon. Baronet moved the following Resolutions:—"That it appears from returns laid before the House, that the amount of levies under authority of the Grand Juries in Ireland was in 1810, 607,000*l.*; in 1821, 755,000*l.*; in 1825, 843,000*l*; and in 1829, 845,000*l.* and upwards:—That the Grand Juries under whose authority these sums are levied, are impanelled at the will and pleasure of the several High Sheriffs, and are not subject to any other than the lowest freehold qualification of 40*s.*, for discharging the duties of that highly responsible office: That the whole of these levies are discharged by the occupying tenantry of the country, and are not subjected in any manner to their intervention or control except so far as may be effected by the circuitous and expensive means of traverse: That the powers of Grand Juries, originally confined to the formation and repair of roads and bridges, have been largely extended to various other highly important and most beneficial objects, of such a nature as more properly to demand a provision for their discharge from the permanent owner of the land than from the temporary occupant: That it is incumbent on the Legislature to bestow their early and zealous attention on the examination of the whole of this system and the correction of its abuses—on the establishment of accurate and regular inquiry into the imposition and destination of these taxes, and the due control of their expenditure—on the equitable division of the burthens of this taxation between the several parties concerned, and on affording to the payers of the taxes adequate powers for checking abuses and controlling the expenditure proportioned to the rate in which they are contributory to their discharge."

Mr. *Maurice Fitzgerald* concurred with his right hon. friend in his view of the great importance of the subject he had introduced to the notice of the House, but he did not concur with him in the regret he expressed that it had not fallen into abler hands. No Member of the House was more competent to the task—and no member from Ireland had ever exerted himself more strenuously or more diligently than his right hon. friend in every measure which could promote the interests of his country; and particularly in endeavouring to reform the abuses which had grown up in its local systems. He did not mean to offer any opposition to the motion of his right hon. friend as there was quite enough on the records of the House, not only to justify, but to demand the interference of Parliament, for the purpose of correcting the evils of which he complained. It would be a great improvement if part of the power now exercised by Grand Juries were taken from them, in order to relieve them from much labour and improve the criminal jurisdiction which they exercised. With the jurisdiction however they had a power of taxation equal almost to that possessed by Parliament. Having this multiplicity of business, it was impossible that Grand Juries could give that attention to each of their duties which its importance demanded. This would be readily conceived when he stated, that it was in evidence before the House that, taking the number of presentments made by Grand Juries, and the time they had bestowed on the whole — the average amount given to each, did not exceed five minutes. Considering the great importance of some of those presentments, embracing, as they often did, very important local alterations, and involving an expenditure of many thousands of pounds, such a brief portion of time was far too short for that consideration which ought to be given to them. It was impossible that justice could be done in such haste. One important matter in the Grand Jury system was, that Jurors might tax the county to any extent, without taxing themselves; for as the system now stood, Grand Juries might tax a county to an unlimited extent, without possessing a single acre of land in it. This was so much at variance with every principle of taxation, that if that were the only evil of the system, the House ought to devise some measure of relief. The whole system was condemned by a report of a Committee of this House. The defects of it were admitted by Grand Juries themselves, who had repeatedly called for the interference of Parliament to correct those defects. That part of the power of Grand Juries which enabled them to assess the county for carrying on works in order to give employment to the poor—ought to be amended, because it was wholly inadequate to its object. It was impossible for him to convey an adequate idea to English gentlemen of the peculiarities of this part of the Irish Grand Jury system. The principle acted on was that of giving to the least possible number of persons employment requiring the least possible quantity of human labour. Supposing that of the sum of 845,000*l.* levied in the counties in Ireland last year, one half was applied to works for the purpose of giving employment to the poor, the other half being for the necessary expenditure of the counties, that sum, if applied on sound principles, would effect a very considerable change in the condition of the labouring poor in Ireland. But how was it applied? Why, the whole of the public works in Ireland were carried on with a credit of six months; or payment was not made till the expiration of six months after the work was completed. Those, therefore, who carried it on must have funds of their own, but the Grand-Jury work was a sort of charity, and therefore it was done at such a low rate of wages to the poor persons employed, as almost to defeat the object, that of giving useful employment to the poor. In this respect great reform was necessary. All public works should be paid for in ready money, and to a departure from that sound principle much of the misery in Ireland might be attributed. He owed an apology to the House for taking up so much of its time on a matter which might seem to many hon. Members to possess only local interest; but he knew no question more important to Ireland than that of giving employment to its poor. It was also of considerable importance to this country, for the large numbers of poor who came over here from Ireland in search of employment, contributed to the distress now felt in many parts of England. He was bound to admit, that under the circumstances of the two countries, the great influx of Irish labourers here was prejudicial. At the same time, he would not have any restriction put on the free intercourse between the two countries, for they deceived themselves who imagined, that the evils of immigration from Ireland could be cured by any other remedy than that of giving the Irish sufficient employment at home. Another circumstance which he could not omit to notice, and he adverted to it because it must be looked in the face, in devising any measure for the employment of the poor of Ireland was the evil of absenteeism. That so many of the owners of the soil of that country should spend the incomes derived from it in other countries, was an evil of which Ireland was every day more and more sensible. There were many absentees, whose great liberality and laudable endeavours to give employment to the poor on their estates deserved great praise, and tended, as far as they were concerned, to lessen the evils of absenteeism; but these were only exceptions to the general practice, which they made appear so much the more mischievous. This at the present moment was a topic of much agitation and excitement in Ireland; and, without any desire to add to either, he must admit that the evils of absenteeism were such as no country in the world could long bear up against. They were evils which nothing could cure. He was disposed to deal with the subject in such a way as to mitigate, in some manner, the evils he could not wholly remove. As he could not compel the absentee to reside in Ireland, he would at least oblige him to do that which he would be disposed to do of himself if he remained in Ireland—contribute to the means of giving employment to the poor. Ireland was so peculiarly circumstanced, that with the greatest national advantages for the profitable employment of capital in commerce, as well as in manufactures, she was devoid of that capital which would call forth her great natural resources. This evil absenteeism had tended to increase and aggravate. He knew that it was a favourite theory with many gentlemen who viewed the influx of Irish poor here as an evil—that the establishment of a system of Poor-laws in Ireland would prevent that influx. No opinion could be more erroneous; and he would pledge himself, when the proper time came, to prove, incontestibly, that the establishment of Poor-laws in Ireland would greatly increase the influx of able-bodied Irish poor into England. He hoped that English gentlemen would be brought to consider the subject more attentively, and he was persuaded that they would admit that neither this nor any other system would be sufficient to do away with the evil of want of employment in Ireland—that nothing would cure that want, but employment itself. In the reports to which his right hon. friend had referred, certain principles were laid down with respect to employment, in every one of which he fully concurred. Under the last Administration it was his intention to bring forward a plan for the employment of the poor in Ireland. It was not a plan hastily thrown out, but the subject of serious and attentive consideration for eleven years. He submitted it to the noble Duke lately at the head of his Majesty's Councils, and to several Members for Ireland, all of whom expressed their approbation of it in strong terms. That plan had the sanction too of his right hon. friend (Sir R. Peel), and it was intended to bring it forward after the great question of relief from civil disabilities on account of religion had been settled. It had also been submitted to the Marquis Wellesley when in Ireland. The only difference between the Duke of Wellington and himself on the subject was this, the noble Duke wished the introduction of the measure to be cautious and gradual, whilst, in his opinion, it ought to be immediate. It would be recollected that in the years of scarcity in Ireland, various measures were adopted by Government for the relief of the poor—and here he must do his right hon. friend lately at the head of the Home Department, the justice of noticing the very great readiness with which he listened to and promoted every humane suggestion made at the time, to relieve the poor in that country. Sums of money were at that time advanced for the purpose of giving them employment, to which his right hon. friend assented; but at the same time strongly pointed out the danger of such precedents, and shewed that they ought not to be followed on future occasions. In that opinion he concurred, as a general principle; while it must be admitted, that the advances were a great relief for the time, and had a very salutary effect on the condition of large masses of the labouring poor. He admitted, that the public taxes ought not to be permanently applied to local improvement. Any capital so applied ought to be repaid with interest, by the county for the benefit of which its application was intended. Still he must contend, that from the sums of public money which had from time to time been advanced for public works in Ireland, much benefit had been derived; and experience shewed, that such advances might be repaid with interest. But these sums were generally applied through commissioners who had not a permanent existence, and who did not possess sufficient knowledge of the country. The interposition of Government on those occasions was a political interposition. Any measures of that kind he should deprecate in the application of funds for the employment of the poor which should have no reference to party politics, nor party patronage. He did not say, that the advances he referred to were so made; but he mentioned this, for the purpose of expressing his conviction that everything of the kind should be studiously avoided. The want of resident proprietors being the great evil affecting Ireland, to remedy that as far as possible, measures of a general and extensive nature should be adopted. If, as one of these, he should propose an advance of capital, it should be on the principle of repayment, with interest. He would not take it from the public treasury, nor make it part of the funded or unfunded Debt. The capital to be applied to the improvement of Ireland should be laid out so advantageously as to yield a profit over and above the sum necessary to pay the interest and the principal of the loan. In the various counties in Ireland, there are different classes of tenants, and different modes of levying the assessments in each county. The present modes are objectionable, as they constitute a heavy tax on the occupying tenantry. It was not consistent with the spirit of humanity to compel the pauper population of Ireland to pay these rates. He could reconcile it neither with a feeling of humanity, nor with a sense of justice, that such a system should be tolerated, that the tenant should pay all the amount of the tax, and the control over it rest entirely with the landlord. He gave notice some time ago of his intention to bring the matter before the House, as it had occupied a considerable portion of his time and attention; and being then a member of the Administration, he had reason to believe that his plan met with the approbation of the Government. No efficient measure could, in fact, be brought into operation without the assistance of the Government; and he should be happy to abandon to it the measure he proposed. The Ministers might make use of it with any amendments they pleased to adopt; and he would most readily give up all the details and documents he had prepared on the subject. He should have proposed an alteration some years ago, but he found considerable difficulty in adjusting the mode of assessment; especially as it regarded the different forms in which lands were held. He could not overcome this inconvenience until, in the course of his inquiries, he met with a very able man, whose knowledge on all matters connected with English taxation and statistics was unequalled, who pointed out a course which obviated most of the difficulties connected with taxation of this nature. The plan was founded on practical inquiries into the situation of Ireland — as to the best means of making its resources available, and of improving the condition of that country, whose situation he deeply lamented. Through his means, a mode of overcoming one of the greatest difficulties Ireland had to contend with had been devised, and there was every prospect that we should be able to overcome it. The great difficulty was in equalizing the mode in which the rate was levied, and taking care that it was properly distributed over the whole district. The remedy suggested was not only applicable to the particular circumstances of this case, but also to all property and all occasions. Suppose you had a proper valuation of the land and the soil made—and this by-the-bye, was being done at the present time, but which valuation must be completed before the plan suggested could be carried into operation, it was proposed that on the valuation of the land being completed, the different parishes should be rated according to the interest they had in the land, or according to the difference of the value of their tenure. It was proposed to do this on the same principle, as the insurance-offices advance money on mortgage. The money raised on each parish by the most just method he could invent, he would place in the hands of commissioners, to be appointed by the Government. Such gentlemen would be above the local prejudices and the local interests which now sometimes led the members of Grand Juries astray, and always exposed their conduct to imputations. Such a tax, too, it was obvious, would be subject to revision at different periods; and such a plan would completely remove all the difficulties of the case. By this means the tax could be shifted with ease from the tenant to the owner. He trusted Government would take the plan into its consideration. It was his intention to bring it formally before the House, but, on referring to the Notice-book, he found that there was not a vacant day until after the adjournment, which, he understood, was to take place next week. Being without information on this point, he had been compelled to avail himself of this opportunity to take part in the discussion on the motion of his right hon. friend, and to introduce some topics not perhaps directly connected with the matter immediately before the House. The subject was of material importance, as far as it was connected with the situation of Ireland. It was impossible to let the matter rest as at present. There had been several committees and numerous reports on the subject, which had led to the belief, that the House intended to do nothing but report, and had no idea of legislating on it. He believed, however, that it was the wish of the present Government, as it was the intention of the late Administration, to bring forward some practical measure. The condition of Ireland would daily grow worse, if Government did not turn its attention to the subject, and bring forward some measure for the improvement of its local institutions. He would not say, "act hastily and unadvisedly," but unless it did something, the danger and risk would increase. If there were a spirit of mischief existing in that country, he could trace it to nothing else than a want of employment; and until that was provided, the condition of the people could not be improved. Some means ought to be adopted to make available their resources, both natural and artificial—resources hardly equalled in any country in the civilized world. It was the bounden duty of the Legislature, as well for the sake of England as of Ireland, to exert itself to accomplish that. He wished to place Ireland in such a situation as that she could have a part, both in the difficulties and the resources of the State. She had hitherto suffered from the subtraction of her produce by her absentee proprietors, and her manufacturers had been ruined, to support that narrow system of monopoly which had been considered necessary for the improvement of England. The House must not merely improve the condition of the people, but also effect a complete alteration in the system of policy. He trusted that, during the long recess of the holidays, Ministers would consider the matter, and soon after the re-assembling of Parliament be prepared with some measures to submit to the attention of the Legislature.

Sir *John Walsh* did not mean, after the able statements of the right hon. members for Waterford and the county of Derry, who had entered so fully into the details of the subject under the consideration of the House, to encroach upon its time by stating the grounds which induced him to support the Resolutions of the right hon. Gentleman. He should be glad to see the right hon. member for Kerry bring forward those ulterior measures which he appeared to contemplate, for the system was so bad as to render anything short of a complete revision an inadequate remedy. He would venture to notice one expression of the member for Kerry's speech—an apology which he made, but which he (Sir J. Walsh) hoped he would never think it necessary to repeat, for occupying the attention of the House with an exclusively Irish question. As an English Member, he wished to declare, that he did not understand the meaning of such an expression. There was no such thing, politically speaking, as an exclusively Irish question; every Irish question was more or less an English one. One reason for a reform of the present system, which had great weight with him, and which neither of the right hon. Gentlemen had noticed, was the moral effect which would be produced upon the peasantry by the removal of so many causes of suspicion and prejudice against their superiors. It was very important to every State, that its institutions should be such as to cultivate the relations of harmony, confidence, and affection, between the upper and lower classes. From the unfortunate, the false position, in which the Grand Juries were placed—from the unlucky manner in which petty, private, personal objects were mixed up with the performance of their public duties, they could not escape the imputation of personal motives in the discharge of their public duties. A new line of road sometimes described a most inexplicable curve in approaching the lodge-gate of one Grand Juryman. A new and valuable contract for some public work was conferred upon the tenant or dependant of another. Such charges had been grossly exaggerated; they formed, he believed, the exception, not the rule, and Grand Juries had generally been conscientious in the performance of duties which ought never to have been confided to them. But it would be an important benefit, resulting from the abolition of the system, that these grounds of suspicion and jealousy in the peasantry would be entirely removed, and that the gentry would no longer be exposed to the odium of such misrepresentations. To one remark he wished to bespeak the attention of the hon. member for Waterford; the consideration, namely, of this measure, with reference to another, of which that hon. Member was almost the solitary advocate. This subject was of great local importance to Ireland; it was a measure of substantial amelioration; it was brought forward on one side, and met by the other with the most eager and sincere desire to adopt the improvement. He might venture to assume, that every Irish question was discussed in the House with a zealous desire to decide it on its merits, with an anxious wish to benefit the sister country, and with a total absence of all party feeling—of all private and personal motives. He would put it, however, to any Irish Member—to any one conversant with the former history of the Irish Parliament—whether, if the hon. Member's domestic legislature were then sitting in its place at Dublin, such would be the spirit in which this question would be considered? When the House remembered how many local interests were concerned, how intimately the Grand Jury and the Irish Representatives would be connected, it could not doubt that this question would excite numberless intrigues, and the greatest irritation and excitement throughout the country. This view, of the justice of which he felt a strong conviction, might perhaps convince the hon. Member that important benefits might be derived from a general, comprehensive, and powerful Legislature, which a local Parliament could not confer.

Mr. *James Grattan* wished, before he alluded to the Resolutions of his right hon. friend, the member for Waterford, to complain of the conduct of his right hon. friend, the member for Kerry. He had sat long in Parliament, and long had this system been complained of; year after year had it been confirmed by laws,—it was, in fact, the creature of the laws,—and yet his right hon. friend had never till now proposed his plan of relief. He only now stated, that he had a plan, when the other right hon. Gentleman had submitted his Resolutions to the House. That plan, however, seemed of little value, for before it could be made available, a general survey must be made of Ireland. [Mr. *Fitzgerald* said, that was not necessary.] He certainly understood his right hon. friend to say so. The House had just ground of complaint, that subjects of this sort were brought forward for discussion, night after night, producing no practical good. On this occasion his right hon. friend came forward with his plan, and communicated to the House a series of Resolutions, which he called upon it hastily to sanction. This was not acting consistently, to call upon the House to agree to Resolutions condemning a system, without immediately suggesting another in its place. It ought not to be forgotten, that this system had been growing up for several years, and had been encouraged by numerous Acts of Parliament. The Grand Juries in Ireland might be considered as so many local Parliaments, and their loss would be materially felt. But let him not be misunderstood, he was no advocate for the present system of Grand Juries; though he certainly believed that, in most instances, the members of those bodies were as anxious properly to discharge the duties of their office, as any hon. Members of that House. The right hon. Gentleman wished for a new mode of levying the local taxes, and said, that not a single gentleman was examined before the committee up-stairs who did not exclaim against the present system. That might be the case, but he was not, therefore, justified in calling upon the House to censure and destroy a system which had been in force upwards of one hundred years, without first providing a substitute. At present the people were enabled to procure, by the means of Grand Juries, those measures for which, under other circumstances, it would be necessary to apply to Parliament, which is always done in England. If Grand Juries were abolished, their duties must be transferred to some other bodies. The right hon. Member stated, that in consequence of the mode in which the Grand Jury assessments were levied and distributed in Ireland, little good was done, but had he devised a better system? Some of the evils might be easily remedied, but he objected to such a sweeping change, especially as it was not clear that good would result from it. The question would be settled in a much more satisfactory manner, and in a much shorter time in Dublin, where the Legislature could readily examine witnesses, and procure documents, and the matter could be discussed much more advantageously there than in this country. The subject, however, had no reference to the question of the Union. The Grand Juries were a sort of local Parliament, which, perhaps, might be spared, and he should be willing to take the powers from them if he could find bodies better able to discharge their duties; but he was not aware, nor had the right hon. member for Waterford mentioned, any bodies that could supply their place advantageously. The situation of Grand Juryman was far from being enviable, for their duties were obnoxious and disagreeable. The office was of such an unthankful nature that few persons who serve would not willingly resign. The charges, indeed, brought against those bodies were, for the most part, utterly destitute of foundation. He had served repeatedly on Grand Juries, and had often seen instances of the most disinterested conduct. That, however, was not the time to go into the details of the merits of the establishment. His right hon. friend, to whom Ireland was under such great obligations, had not, perhaps, much practical knowledge of Grand Juries, and he had exaggerated their defects. He stated that, on an average of a few years, 800,000*l*. had been expended annually by these bodies, and that nearly one-half was expended for purposes for which it was not originally intended that Grand Juries should provide, or on objects highly useful and important, but which ought rather to be paid for by the permanent owner of the soil. The Grand Juries, however, ought not to be blamed for these acts, as they were compelled by law to make the presentments on oath; and he believed, in most instances, it would be impossible to make them with a greater regard to the public service than at present. He would not take upon him to defend all the acts of those bodies, and he should not be sorry to see an alteration, but he should most strenuously oppose any measure which would throw the power into the hands of Government. Any system of Boards appointed by Government would not only be found to be infinitely more expensive, but also liable to the strongest objection on principle. Any system which would take the power out of the hands of the resident Irish gentlemen would not be desirable, as it must have a tendency to increase absenteeism. The great object to be aimed at for Ireland was, to give the gentlemen of Ireland an interest in the management of the country. His right hon. friend, he knew, was averse from absenteeism, and, like him, conceived that absentees were great evils; but his plans would increase absenteeism. To take away from the gentlemen the power of regulating the local taxes would lessen their motives to reside in the country, and would increase the number of absentees. On the whole, the evils were great, but not so great as to require the system to be entirely abolished. It would be idle and vain to talk of a beneficial measure for Ireland, which had not for its basis to induce gentleman to reside on their estates. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. M. Fitzgerald) talked of his plans for the improvement of Grand Juries, but why had he not brought some measure forward for that purpose during the thirty years that he had been in Parliament, instead of letting the evil increase to its present magnitude? He was satisfied that an Act of Parliament containing a very few words, would do more to correct the evils of the system than a voluminous, or rather a number of voluminous Acts. He had himself brought forward a proposition to levy the rates on an improved system, three years ago, and to his surprise the right hon. Gentleman had forgotten it. He was, probably, not in the House at the time, for he certainly took no part in the Debate. One evil, which imperiously called for the interposition of the House, was the power exercised by the Commissioners for Public Works in Ireland. The expenses of these fell extremely heavy on the Irish counties. The Grand Juries made a presentment, money was advanced from the Consolidated Fund much too liberally, and a heavy debt was contracted. With respect to the Resolutions, the right hon. member for Waterford called upon the House to agree to his declaratory propositions, condemning the present system, without at the same time bringing forward his remedy; and the House would act very inconsistently if it agreed to these propositions, and did not pass some measure to remove the alleged evil. It would be a great reflection on the House, that it admitted the existence of a great evil, and did not immediately provide a remedy. The principal improvement which could be made in the constitution of Grand Juries would be, to have a more frequent change of members. The same persons serving nearly on all occasions as Grand Jurymen had been the cause of a great portion of the prejudice on the subject. It was considered that they formed a sort of packed body—a species of corporation, and the consequence was, that their proceedings were viewed with great jealousy. This was a difficulty which could easily be remedied; for instance, by electing so many gentlemen from each Barony every year, and by a constant change taking place, the feeling that they did not assess themselves fairly would appear, as it really was, utterly groundless. With respect to the expenditure, a much greater and more efficient check might be had by increasing the number of the returns to be made by the Surveyors of Works; but the complaints on this point were greatly exaggerated. These were the principal objections, all of which could be easily remedied. There were, he admitted, great evils, under the present system; but at the same time he was bound to say, that equal or greater objections might be made to all the systems yet devised.

Mr. *Maurice Fitzgerald* denied, that he had made any attack on the character of Grand Juries. He had admitted that the members of them had good intentions, but the system under which they worked was so bad that it was impossible they could execute their duties.

Sir *Robert Peel* wished to make a few observations on the course of the proceeding rather than on the substance of the Motion. The right hon. Baronet had proposed five Resolutions in detail, calling on the House to affirm several important matters. The House should be careful how it affirmed those matters; and he would therefore suggest, that it would be better, before affirming those matters, that the House should see the Resolutions in print, and have an opportunity of well considering the subject. He objected, then, to the course adopted by the right hon. Baronet. The object of the Resolutions was, to declare that the lessee should not pay the cess, which should be paid by the lessor. He wished the House of Commons to declare that the occupier ought not to pay the assessment; but surely the interval between the House of Commons making that declaration and passing a bill to impose the payment on the other class should be as short as possible. When the right hon. Baronet remembered the agitated state of Ireland, he would himself see the propriety of not condemning one system by a resolution of that House before the Legislature were prepared to establish another. His right hon. friend (Mr. M. Fitzgerald) knew that he did not agree to all his views. He objected to establishing any Board, whether under the Government or not, to regulate local taxation. Local taxation should, he thought, be regulated by local authorities, which he preferred to any Board. The object, he thought, should be, to establish a local authority, but to place that authority under certain restrictions, and subject its acts to revision. Certainly he objected strongly to the present plan of allowing one individual to name all the members of these little Parliaments, as the Grand Juries were called. All the objections to Select Vestries applied with great force to a body of twenty-three persons, selected by one individual. He wanted to see the people of Ireland take an interest in such institutions themselves, and he should like to see them establish, with certain checks, institutions for local expenditure such as were in England. He did not wish to see the body to which this power was intrusted very numerous—it might nearly approach the number of an English Grand Jury. He wished next to separate the judicial power from the power of levying taxes. If twenty-three gentlemen asserted that a tax was necessary, or if they, as the taxing body, should feel objections to any tax proposed, he should not be disposed to prefer the decision of any other body, particularly if they were taken from the land-owners, and the land-owners were to be, as was proposed, the rate-payers. On this body, however, there ought to be a check. It should have the absolute power to levy taxes for useful works; but, to have an assurance against jobs, two means might be employed so as to ensure that the money was expended properly. He would give a veto to some Board on any project involving a large expense—such as several thousand pounds; and he would not allow the work to be done, except by public contract. He knew no other body so likely as this to determine correctly what works were useful. Then there ought to be, on the part of the public authority, a power to compel the Grand Jury to give an account of all the money expended. He could not see in this case any objection to give such a power to the Government; and he did not know why the Treasurer of the County should not be called on to render an account of all the money he was authorised to expend. These were the great principles on which he would proceed. With respect to advancing money for public works—though he admitted that, in particular cases, it had been advantageous—he could not give his assent to it as a general system. To give 100,000*l.* to relieve urgent distress might be necessary; but to employ the public funds to find employment for the people, was likely to stimulate population beyond its due proportion. It would interfere with the natural demand for labour; and, as the stimulus could not be continually and perpetually applied, it must end in a convulsion and greater distress than it was intended to relieve. It could not confer a permanent benefit on the country. Moreover, to advance money on a great scale for carrying on public works, would not accord in any manner with the general financial system of this country. In conclusion, the right hon. Gentleman apologised to the House for the length of his remarks, and expressed a hope that they would not be considered as at all tending to undervalue the exertions of the right hon. Baronet, or lessen the importance of the object he had in view.

Mr. *O'Connell* thought the views of the right hon. Baronet who had just sat down deserved attention. Every person admitted, that the present system was monstrous. He had never heard any Gentleman defend the system except the hon. member for Wicklow. The principle was bad. It was taxation without representation, and those who levied the taxes were not the payers. In many instances the Grand Jury had no concern with the law. He had known a case where taxation to the amount of several thousand pounds was levied by a Grand Jury, five of whom had been discharged under the Insolvent Debtors' Act. Was it not a shame that ninety acres of bad land should pay as much, as had been stated by a right hon. Gentleman, as 1,000 acres of equally good land? Great praise had been frequently bestowed on the Parliament for its attention to Irish matters, but here was an abuse existing for thirty years without any remedy. Was Ireland to be grateful for that? He did not think she ought to be, unless her gratitude was political gratitude, which had been defined, to be a lively sense of future favours. He admitted the propriety of having local authorities, but those who assessed the taxes should be the taxpayers. Ireland was divided into baronies, and the plan he should recommend would be this:—He would have each barony select two men when any public works were necessary, who should make a presentment for them to the Assistant Barrister, and he would give to these two men and the Assistant Barrister the power of settling the maximum of the assessment. Their presentment should go before the Grand Jury, who should have no power to enlarge it; but if they disapproved of it, they might diminish it. The Grand Jury should then have the power to order the works to be executed, but by no other means than by contracts publicly announced and publicly formed, and the contractors should be obliged to pay their labourers in money. This would be a constitutional means of improving the system. He would say, that at present the discontent in Ireland on account of the Grand Jury system was excessive, and could not, perhaps, be exceeded. He was happy to hear the right hon. Baronet's good wishes to-night, but he would rather have had some good deeds from him before he went out of Office.

Lord *Althorp* agreed with all the Gentlemen who had spoken as to the great importance of this subject; and admitted, that it was necessary that the Government should turn its attention to the matter. The right hon. Baronet who had introduced the subject, confined himself to the evils of the Grand Jury system; the right hon. Gentleman who spoke subsequently (Mr. M. Fitzgerald) had discussed many of the peculiarities in the condition of Ireland. He meant to confine himself to the subject before the House, and he would say, that the Government would be very happy to receive the plan which the right hon. Gentleman said he had formed for the improvement of that system. It was admitted that the evils of the system were great, and they were principally caused by the fact, that the rates were imposed by persons who had to pay no part of them. That was not what ought to be. It was contrary to sound principles, and was open to many objections. He did not, however, think the plan recommended by the hon. and learned member for Waterford would answer the object proposed. It would be very complicated, and be exposed to many difficulties. In England the parish roads were indeed kept in repair by each parish, but each parish was liable to be indicted if the roads were not kept in good order. In Ireland, he believed, the great difficulty was, to find fit and proper persons to execute any local system, and constitute local bodies. There was no difficulty of that kind in England, where the people had long been accustomed to manage their own affairs. He would not pledge himself to any decided course, nor give a decided opinion what ought to be done. He believed, however, that his right hon. friend, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, had a Bill prepared to improve the Grand Jury system, and the Government hoped that it might be carried into effect with great advantage.

Mr. *G. Dawson* admitted, that the principles of the system were bad, but he denied that the Grand Jurors who carried it into execution were corrupt. The materials were good, but the plan was bad. Landlords ought to have the power of levying these taxes, and that system would be no improvement which took that power from them. It was proper to keep up their connection with the county, and their interest was deeply concerned in the proper administration of the county funds. Under the present arrangement of the business transacted before the Grand Juries, it was impossible for them to devote more than two minutes to the consideration of each presentment, and it therefore followed, as a matter of course, that great laxity and many abuses crept into the administration of the county-rates. In his opinion, much of the difficulty at present experienced by the Magistrates, and many of the abuses of the system, might be got rid of by appointing a number of Magistrates in each county to assemble twice a year, for the transaction of no other kind of business than that connected with presentments, and the application of the rates collected for public purposes. This would, he was satisfied, be productive of the best effects; for he could not agree with those who thought the Irish counties were wantonly and extravagantly rated for county purposes. In point of fact, a much larger sum was collected in the English counties, under the name of County-rates, than the whole of the sums which were said to be so illegally taken in Ireland. By a return made a short time ago to that House, it appeared, that the County-rates of England amounted to something considerably above 2,000,000*l.*; and yet the system which prevailed in England was that which it was wished the Legislature should extend to Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by protesting against the plan of the Knight of Kerry, for placing the funds of the counties under the control of Commissioners.

Mr. *Wyse* admitted, that the members of Grand Juries were very honourable men; but such was the vicious system, that the most honourable men could not act virtuously, at least their conduct could not possibly have the appearance of virtue. The evils of the present system were immense, and they all arose from those who levied the rates and administered them being irresponsible. He was opposed to the system suggested by the member for Kerry; but he approved of the principle of that suggested by the member for Waterford though not of its details. He thought the better plan would be, to divide the powers of the Grand Juries into two parts, leaving to the Magistrates the judicial power which they at present exercised, and permitting the rate-payers to elect from the whole body a certain number, to whom they would be willing to commit the administration of the county funds. In fact, he would give the rate-payers the power to tax themselves, by means of a committee of Magistrates elected for the year; but he objected to a board of any kind, as a delusive scheme, which would perpetuate the abuses the Legislature wished to remove. The principle he would follow in reforming the Grand Juries of Ireland should be the same as he would follow in reforming that House—he would give to the people a full and an open election of those who were to represent, or to tax them. He was satisfied that by no scheme, though many palliatives might be found, would the evil be effectually cured, unless the principle were acted on, of giving to the rate-payers a full and efficient control over the whole of the money raised. While he was on this subject, he would say, that he approved of the system of loans which the right hon. Baronet had condemned. He thought, that, in the present condition of Ireland, it would stimulate the people to industry, and provide permanent employment, without burthening the country with any of the evils of pauperism. All that Ireland wanted was, to have her revenues properly brought into use, and he was quite satisfied that advantage might be procured, from the advancement of money by way of loan, without the loss of a single shilling to the lender. In consequence of the declaration of his Majesty's Ministers, that they were determined to take the subject under consideration, he would abstain from troubling the House with any further observations; but he would take leave to say, in conclusion, that he was happy to find that the administration was disposed to turn its attention to the condition of Ireland, and he hoped the people of that country, when they heard that Parliament was in reality and in good earnest occupied with those questions in which they had an interest, would feel that the day of retribution which they wished for was come, not in wrong and in bloodshed, but that it had brought forth an earnest desire to promote their welfare as a division of the empire, and to develope, to its utmost extent, their almost unbounded national resources.

Mr. *Owen O'Connor* expressed the gratification he felt at finding that at length we had a Government which was willing to lend its attention to the complaints of the people of Ireland.

Mr. *W. O'Brien* was of opinion, that the plan recommended by the Knight of Kerry would, on inquiry, be found the fittest for the proper management of the County-rates, and the best calculated to get rid of the evils of the present system. Objections might, of course, be raised to commissioners, such as the right hon. Gentleman proposed; but he was convinced that the plan would destroy the improper powers vested in the Grand Juries; and if the right hon. Gentleman (the Knight of Kerry) had entered more into a detail of his plan and of the course to be pursued by the commissioners, he thought many of the arguments against it would have been obviated. One good effect of placing the management of county-rates in the hands of commissioners would be, to ensure ready money to the labourer, while it would, at the same time, secure the effectual execution of all public works at half the present expense.

Mr. *Spring Rice* suggested to his right hon. friend the propriety of withdrawing the Resolutions, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had declared it to be the intention of Government to take the subject under its immediate care.

Sir *John Newport* had not entertained a hope that the Resolutions would be carried; but he was satisfied with the attention bestowed on them, and would withdraw them.

Resolutions accordingly withdrawn.

THE LIVING OF STANHOPE.] Mr. *Charles Wynne*, before the noble Viscount (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) proceeded to move for the committee on Public Salaries, begged leave to ask him a question on a subject in which he believed the public took a peculiar and extraordinary interest. He wished to know if Ministers persisted in the determination of their predecessors, to permit the living of Stanhope to be held by Dr. Phillpotts, *in commendam* with the See of Exeter?

Lord *Althorp*, in reply to the hon. Member's question, said, that his Majesty's Ministers, upon finding a great objection prevailing throughout the country on the subject of such an union, had felt it their duty to advise his Majesty to abstain from issuing the instruments required for that purpose.

SALARIES OF PUBLIC OFFICERS.] Lord *Althorp* then rose to move for a Select Committee to inquire into the

Salaries of Offices held during the pleasure of the Crown, of which he had given notice. He said, it was the firm determination of his Majesty's Ministers to enforce the most rigid economy, and to effect a thorough retrenchment in every department of the State; but in order to leave them the power to enforce this economy and retrenchment with a proper effect, and in order to enable them to call on others to make sacrifices, his Majesty's Ministers felt it their duty to begin by making sacrifices themselves. Under ordinary circumstances, it was undoubtedly better that the Government should take on itself the responsibility of proposing to Parliament those reductions and alterations which it thought expedient, without throwing the labour of the research on a committee of the House; but Ministers conceived that they were less competent to come to a conclusion with respect to the amount of their own salaries than they might be with reference to those of others. They thought, therefore, that the more satisfactory course would be, to leave the question of the amount of their own salaries to an independent committee of the House; "and I hope, (the noble Lord continued), that the committee which I mean to propose will be found to be as independent of the Government as any committee can be constituted in this House. I am well aware of the necessity of satisfying the country, that it is the sincere and honest intention of the Government to carry the reductions in all the public establishments to the utmost extent which may be found consistent with a due regard to the public service. Looking, however, at reductions of this kind, I think it necessary to say, that they may be, perhaps, carried too far. I think it would, indeed, be exceedingly unwise and impolitic that we should reduce the salaries so low as to leave no office capable of being held, unless by a man possessing a large private fortune. That is, I think, a principle which the most ardent lover of economy would not wish to see carried into effect. The principle of economy Ministers are determined to carry into effect is this, that wherever the mere patronage of the Government is concerned, there shall be no limit to the reductions, but where the wants of the public service require efficient officers, then economy shall be only a secondary consideration, carried as far as it can be in accordance with the principles of the Government, but never permitted to interfere with that which they conceive to be demanded for the proper conduct of public business. Thinking, then, that the whole question can be most favourably brought under the consideration of a committee, and believing as I do that no objection will be offered to such a motion, I propose to appoint one, because I think it is called for by the unanimous voice of the country. I feel it my duty, at the same time, to warn those who are looking with anxiety to the effect of reductions, that they must not expect any extensive relief from anything which can be taken from the salaries of the Government officers. Much as such a measure may be desired by the advocates for economy, I think it right to say, that it will produce but a very small diminution in the amount of the taxation with which the public is burthened; but small as may be the relief, it will produce that which is of much more importance in the present state of the public mind; it will give satisfaction to the people, and convince them that economy is with the present Government no idle profession. It will prove to the people, that the Ministers are determined to make the necessary retrenchment of expenditure, and display the sincerity of their intentions by beginning with their own emoluments. Having said so much respecting the public opinion, the objects of the Government, and the mode in which it proposes to carry those objects into effect, I would now add, that the same reasons which have prevented us from coming to any decision with respect to the amount of the salaries which we conceive necessary for the support of our respective offices, have induced us to refrain from naming any person as a member of the committee who may be supposed to be in the slightest degree under the influence of the Government. In the nomination of the committee, I have, indeed, felt it right to adopt as a precedent the course pursued by my noble friend, Lord Lansdown, in the year 1806; who, in appointing a committee to inquire into the state of the Finances, selected no Member who held an office of any description under the Administration. I believe, however, it will be necessary, as a matter of form, that my own name should be placed on the list; but I trust that the reasons and objections I have stated will, with the committee itself, form an excuse for my non-attendance." The noble Lord concluded by moving the appointment of a "Select Committee, to inquire what Reductions can be made in the Salaries and Emoluments of Office held during the pleasure of the Crown by Members of either House of Parliament, and to report their Opinion and Observations thereupon to the House."

Mr. *Bankes* thought the Ministers might, perhaps, have adopted a better course, if they had come down with a proposition of their own for the reduction of their salaries, rather than have thrown on a committee the ungracious task of determining what should be the amount. He did not, however, rise at that moment to apply himself to the question, but to ask the noble Lord if there was any foundation for the report of the intended removal of Sir Anthony Hart from the Lord Chancellorship of Ireland?

Lord *Althorp* said, he felt bound, in the first place, to apologize to the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Dawson) for not possessing the requisite information to answer a question on the same subject, which he put to him on a former evening. The truth was, that he had just returned from his election, and had not had an opportunity of communicating with the members of the Government until he took his place in the House. In answer to the question of the hon. member for Dorsetshire, he had now to state, that the Government felt it required an intimate and confidential assistant in the government of Ireland in the person of the Lord Chancellor, and they had, therefore, determined on making a change in that office; but they had taken such steps, and made such arrangements with respect to the removal of Sir Anthony Hart, that no real increase of the burthens of the people would be the consequence.

Mr. *Bankes*, in reply to this declaration, said, he felt himself bound at once to stigmatise this proceeding of the Government as a job of the most obnoxious kind; and as a job of an Administration which set out with such loud professions, and which placed its claims to public support on its principles of economy. He must say, that it excited his wonder and surprise, not unmixed with a feeling of deep regret. He had hopes that the Administration would have attempted to justify the expectations of economy which were so universally entertained; but the avowal of this job taught him that his hopes were vain. Perhaps he had said too much—more than he ought— until he heard the explanation that was promised; and he should, therefore, merely add, that he waited for it with impatience.

Mr. *G. Dawson* said, that as this subject had excited a very general interest in England, as well as in Ireland, he hoped the noble Lord would excuse his putting to him another question connected with the rumour of another removal. Sir Anthony Hart, the present Lord Chancellor, made no objection, as far as he understood, to continue to hold his place; and he believed it was admitted by the Bar and the country, that no man was better qualified to perform its duties with honour to himself and advantage to the suitors. It should also be recollected, that Sir Anthony Hart was sent to Ireland purely and solely because he was not connected with any of its political parties, and because he was not disposed to meddle with any of the contending factions of the time—but they now heard, and he confessed he heard it with pain, that the Chancellor was to be replaced by a political substitute, whose inclination it was, and from whom it was required as a duty, that he should meddle with parties, and renew that hatred and dissatisfaction which had for some time been so happily repressed. This was not all however; he understood that it was also contemplated to give a retiring allowance to the Chief Baron, in order that he might be replaced by some other political friend of the Government, although that Judge was as competent as any other in Ireland to fulfil his duties, and no adequate reason could be advanced to justify his retirement. The consequence of all this would be, to saddle the country with two retiring pensions in order that the Government might place two political supporters in the place of the Lord Chancellor and Chief Baron in Ireland. He (Mr. Dawson) would not complain of this in ordinary cases, but when he was told that retrenchment was the one sole object of the Government, and when he found that Ministers rested their claim to public confidence, and their reputation as a Government, on the fulfilment of their pledges of economy; and when he found that one of their first acts was to displace two eminent Judges, who would be entitled to demand large retiring pensions from the public, he confessed he could not avoid expressing his surprise and apprehension. Now, one word more as to the apology of the noble Lord. The noble Lord said, that he was not aware of the intention of the Government until after he took his seat in the House. But were there no means of sending a letter to the noble Lord, acquainting him with the wishes of the Premier, before the measure was determined on? If there was not, what became of the responsibility of the noble Lord as Chancellor of the Exchequer? Was the Prime Minister to make arrangements so materially affecting the finances of the country without consulting the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was responsible, by virtue of his office, for the expenditure of the public money, and the fulfilment of the pledges of retrenchment? The whole matter might be capable of explanation, but in the present extraordinary appearance which it assumed, he could not give it his approval.

Lord *Althorp*, in reply to the last observation of the right hon. Gentleman, said, that the Chief Baron had already been twenty-five years on the Bench, and had expressed a strong wish to retire. He begged also to say, in answer to the right hon. Gentleman's charge of the wish of the Government to appoint political partisans, that the persons appointed to these situations were no political friends of the present Administration, but, on the contrary, men appointed by an Administration with which they had nothing whatever to do. The Government, therefore, had no personal motive to do wrong; and it would be found, on examination, that they had promoted, in all cases, men never politically connected with them as a party. There might be an exception with respect to the Lord Chancellor. The right hon. Gentleman says, that the Lord Chancellor should not be connected with the opinions of the Government. Now, up to the time of the appointment of Sir Anthony Hart, the Chancellor had always been a political associate. It was necessary that he should be in constant communication with the Lord Lieutenant, to whom was intrusted the executive government of Ireland; and if he was not a person who could hold a confidential communication on the views of the Government in England, he could not efficiently perform the duties of his station. The appointment of Sir Anthony Hart was considered politic at a peculiar crisis, and because it was wished to avoid some difficulties connected with the Catholic Question? but if the Chancellor was not, in ordinary circumstances, the complete and confidential depositary of the views of the Administration, the difficulties attending the situation of the Government would be increased to such a degree as to be almost insurmountable.

Mr. *Holme Sumner* observed, that as it was understood that the Committee on the Civil List was not to proceed until after the holidays, it was evident that his Majesty's Ministers had determined, very manfully, in his opinion, to take upon themselves the responsibility of proposing a plan on that subject. He regretted, however, that on the subject now before the House, they had shown a disposition to withdraw from a similar responsibility, by proposing the appointment of a committee to consider it; and that on the plea that they were not competent or proper judges. He very readily allowed that the Members of whom the Committee was to consist would probably be free from Government influence; but if a committee was considered the best course in this instance, why not refer the Civil List to a similar committee, to proceed immediately to the discharge of their functions?—Why adopt two courses.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* said, he was surprised at, and regretted the speeches which had just been delivered by the hon. members for Dorset and Guildford, for they were conceived in a most ungenerous spirit. Had his Majesty's Ministers proposed a committee composed of themselves, or their immediate dependants, no hon. Members would have assailed the plan with greater vehemence or indignation. The course pursued by the noble Lord was manly, and indicative of good intentions. The Ministers proposed to effect economy by their own example, and at the same time to disarm those who might complain of its rigour by an appeal to their own privations, effected indeed, not by themselves, but at the instance of a committee selected from political opponents and unconnected parties. Economy in ministerial offices is to be the basis of general retrenchment, and it was impossible to deny that the plan proposed was the most impartial method of effecting both objects, and would obtain for its authors to the motives of the Members, even when they acted most correctly; so long would the people be prejudiced against their acts; and so long would the country withhold its confidence from them. For that reason, were it only for the sake of keeping the public establishments at the point at which they ought to be kept, at the point at which it was necessary, for the good and safety of the country, they should be kept; he wished for a solid, a substantial, but at the same time a temperate reform. He was persuaded that then, and not till then, it would be in the power of any committee of that House to allay, by their acts, the ferment in the public mind, with respect to the amount of official appointments and salaries. He looked forward with hope and confidence to the time when the Ministry of this country might refer to the consideration of a House, consisting of the genuine Representatives of the people, any measure which they might think necessary for the public service, in the full confidence that men chosen for their integrity and their judgment, in giving their approbation to such measure, would carry with them the confidence of the public that they had given it on solid grounds of public interest, and not on any considerations of a private character.

Mr. *Keith Douglas* was quite of opinion, with the hon. member for Colchester—that the utmost practicable economy was indispensably necessary for the safety of the country; and strongly recommended that some means should be adopted for relieving the people from the distress in which they were involved by want of employment. He agreed with the noble Lord, that the best course was, to submit the subject to the consideration of a committee, and did not agree with the hon. member for Guildford, that it would have been better had Ministers proposed a plan of their own. There could be no doubt that public officers should be adequately paid for the efficient performance of public services; but in leaving this subject to the consideration of a committee, he thought the noble Lord had done much better than if he had originated any spontaneous and voluntary recommendation.

Mr. *Jephson* was understood to say, that the Government would have done better had it not followed the precedents set by other Administrations, and had taken the opportunity of separating the office of Lord Chancellor from any political attributes. The late appointments were, he believed, very unpopular. It had long been felt at the Bar of Ireland, that the legal appointments in that country were not the result of superior merit; and the recent proceedings would confirm that conviction.

Sir *Francis Burdett* said, that he should not have trespassed upon the House on this occasion, but he felt that he could hardly do justice to his constituents, or to himself, if he did not take the earliest opportunity of explicitly declaring his feelings with respect to the present Administration, of avowing his confidence in the Gentlemen who composed it, and of stating his belief, that there never had been any Administration in this country, which in so short a time (he might say, before they were well placed in their offices) had come forward so promptly, so earnestly, and so satisfactorily, in proposing so many advantages to the public, and had done so many acts in earnest of the sincerity of their professions, as the gentlemen to whom he should now have the honour—if they proceeded upon the principles which they had laid down, and pursued their course in the same way they had hitherto done—of giving his unequivocal support in every way in his power. The new Administration offered new hopes to the country, and he hoped it would be the means of relieving it from the consequences of the uncontrolled misgovernment to which it had till now been subject. With respect to the particular subject now before the House, he could not conceive how it could be better dealt with, than in the way that was proposed, nor did he see the advantage of Ministers coming forward, and placing themselves in the invidious situation of reducing emoluments. He agreed with the hon. Member who had just sat down, that no benefit would arise to the public from a niggardly scale of economy, or from withholding a fair remuneration for services which ought to be not merely amply, but, he would say, generously and liberally paid. The posts to which duties of this nature were attached ought to be held out, not only as objects of ambition, but ought to present such objects as would induce men of ability to employ their talents and their energies in the public service, rather than in any other of the pursuits in which, from their station in life, they might be likely to engage. He should be sorry to see clerks, in official situations, not handsomely and generously remunerated; and, so far as regarded the great Officers of State, he did not himself conceive that any retrenchment could be made, or, at all events, it could only be to a very limited extent. In most cases the salaries of office did no more than meet the necessary expenses that were attendant upon the appointment. He must therefore protest against that niggardly economy which would produce nothing to the public, and would be in itself ungenerous and unjust. But the larger economy alluded to by the hon. member for Colchester was of a different kind. With that this Committee would have nothing to do, and the public could derive no benefit from its labours in that respect. But this Administration had to do with it; and on that subject they were bound to proceed as they had promised. A noble Lord below him had truly stated, that no effectual economy could be realised, and no difficulties thoroughly overcome, unless that House were differently constituted from what it was at present. The mode in which the noble Lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had conducted himself, on every occasion since he had assumed office, was such as, in every possible view, to challenge public approbation and confidence. It was manifest, from the measures of those now in power, that they had been selected on account of their talents, and on account of their agreeing as to the necessity of a new mode and form of Government, such as the present circumstances of the country demanded. There was only one thing in the recent change which he regretted, but there must always be something to be regretted in the most favourable events. There was a right hon. Baronet* whom he should have been glad to see comprised in the new arrangement, because he was sure, from the diligence and ability which he had applied to subjects of finance, his experience would have been most valuable, and the benefit of his services would have been in every way gratifying to the wishes of the public. Such was the only subject of regret which he had on the present occasion. He congratulated the country also on the circumstance of the Ministers being supported by a King, who not only attracted towards himself the loyalty which characterised every constitutional Englishman, but who was remarkable for the exercise of those virtues which ensured devoted attachment to the person, as well as fidelity to the King on the Throne, and whose support would enable the Ministers to carry those strong measures which might be necessary for the interests of the country. They would also be supported by those who had no other views the public views; and he was persuaded that the country, notwithstanding the difficulties by which it was surrounded, would have no reason to despair, but, on the contrary, every reason to hope, that all the evils which pressed upon it would be speedily alleviated, and would, by that ability and attention which he was confident would be applied to them, be altogether, and finally, relieved. With these feelings he had thought that he should not be acting fairly, either by the Government or his constituents, if he did not express his confidence in the present Ministry, and his expectation that they would succeed in pleasing all parties. But there was, indeed, one party which he had forgotten, and which had been mentioned by an individual very conversant with business, and well calculated to form a judgment, as more mischievous than any other party. The individual was a great diplomatist, and the party to which he alluded was that of the "Impatients." They were the only party who now remained to be dealt with, and he trusted that the Government would, by its measures, confirm the favourable impressions which its course had hitherto created.

Mr. *Goulburn* agreed perfectly with the hon. Baronet in the propriety of fairly remunerating public men for their services, and of not resorting to a petty economy, calculated to defeat its own object. He hoped that the measures which his Majesty's present Government intended to bring forward would prove as beneficial as he could not doubt they intended them to be. When he was himself a member of Government, and brought forward any measure which he thought advantageous to the country, he always thought it entitled to a candid construction. In the same manner, although he should use due vigilance with respect to the measures which might be brought forward by the present Government, he was ready to put upon those measures the most candid construction.

---

* Sir F. Burdett was understood to allude to Sir H. Parnell.

Mr. *Littleton* declared his great satisfaction at the observations which had just been made by his right hon. friend. Considering the station which that right hon. Gentleman had occupied, he was sure the people of England would mark with great applause the handsome conduct which he now pursued. He hoped that an end would be put, as far as was practicable, to the system of managing business by Committees of that House. He thought that the interests of monarchy in the country had been greatly prejudiced by the practice of delegating to committees of the people matters which ought to be arranged by the Crown, under the responsibility, of course, of the King's advisers. There was one point adverted to by the hon. member for Dorsetshire, upon which he would make an observation. He, for one, approved of the appointment of Lord Plunkett as Chancellor of Ireland. He considered that it was the duty of the heads of the Administration to see that there were placed in those posts of which they had the patronage persons with whom they could have a cordial and confidential understanding in the principles which they professed. They should not lose any opportunity which their patronage offered of receiving the services of such men; and he was sure that the people of England would not regret a few thousand pounds in addition, if that expenditure strengthened an Administration whose professions had already gained them so much credit.

Lord *Valletort* concurred in the observation of the hon. Baronet, that public servants ought to be properly remunerated. If individuals were employed who were without the necessary practical knowledge, great and permanent injury might result to the country. He meant also, though sitting on the same side of the House as the hon. member for Colchester, to have the pleasure, and to him it would be a great one from its novelty, of voting with him for the present Ministers whenever their actions deserved his support.

Sir *E. B. Sugden* could not conceive why another Judge should be appointed in the place of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland. It ought not to be forgotten, that Sir Anthony Hart was not appointed by the late Government, but by the Government of Mr. Canning. When it was recollected that many of the present Ministers coalesced, and joined, and, if he might use so vulgar an expression, worked with that Administration, which appointed Sir Anthony Hart, he would ask, was it not curious, that without any reason given, without any ground advanced, with reference only to political sentiments, they should now remove him? Sir Anthony Hart was not a political character, he had never been a member of the House of Commons, nor was he ever placed in a situation where he could manifest strong political feelings. Did it not then appear extraordinary that Lord Chancellor Hart should be deposed, to make room for Lord Plunkett, merely on the allegation that it was right that every Government should have perfect confidence in the political sentiments of all who were in any way connected with it? Was there any thing in the political sentiments of Sir Anthony Hart which rendered it fit that he should be removed? If such a case were made out—if it were shown that the political sentiments of that Gentleman prevented him from forming a close and cordial connection with Ministers—then he would, for one, admit (hard as it was on the country to be burthened with those large payments) that his removal was justifiable. But when Ministers came forward with professions of economy, and at the same time settled a pension of 4,000*l.* a-year on one learned Judge, and of somewhere about 3,000*l.* a year upon another, no necessity being pointed out for such a proceeding, it could not escape without animadversion. He did not mean to say that it might not be justified; but unquestionably some reason ought to be given for entailing so large an expense on the country.

Lord *Palmerston* expressed his surprise, after his noble friend had clearly stated that he should be able satisfactorily to explain this transaction, when the details of the arrangement came before the House, to hear the hon. and learned Gentleman make the accusation which he had just done.

Sir *E. B. Sugden*:—I did not hear the noble Lord's speech.

Lord *Palmerston* was sorry that the hon. hon. and learned Gentleman was not in the House when his noble friend made his statement; but he thought that a person of the hon. and learned Gentleman's experience ought not to have given utterance to such unqualified opinions without hearing the speech which he rose to answer, He, however, made those observations, it now appeared, without hearing that speech. He did not mean at present to go into any large discussion on the arrangement in question, because, on a future occasion, the details would be fully stated, and on them the propriety of the proceeding would be defended. But he must say, that it required no great intelligence to show, notwithstanding what had been said by the hon. and learned Gentleman, that the situation of Chancellor could not be divested of political character. The person who held the situation of Chancellor, either of England or Ireland, was obliged to have constant communication with the Ministers of the Crown, and he must, therefore, possess their full political confidence; very great inconvenience would ensue if that seat were occupied by an individual not possessing that confidence. One of the parties alluded to, he believed, wished to retire; and the whole arrangement would, he had no doubt, give satisfaction to the country. The statement of his noble friend seemed to meet the general approbation of the House. He was anxious that it should do so, because Ministers felt that it was only by the concurrence of that House that they could act for the benefit of the country. They came into office at a period of peculiar difficulty, in whatever way they looked to the various interests which were committed to their charge; but it was gratifying to them to find, so far as they had explained the principle which they meant to pursue, that it met with the approbation of the House, as he was persuaded it would that of the country; and it was only so long as they possessed the confidence of both, that they wished to continue in the situation which they now held.

Mr. *Calcraft* contended, that his hon. and learned friend (Sir E. B. Sugden) had a right to make the observations he had done on a subject which had been twice or thrice mentioned in the House, until he received the information he demanded. He now begged leave to state his own opinion with respect to that appointment. Looking to the talents and experience of the noble Lord (Plunkett), and considering the great service which he might render in Ireland, he thought that any Government which could avail themselves of his assistance in the public service, would be extremely culpable if it neglected to do so. He regretted that any additional expense should be imposed on the country, but he did not begrudge it, as it was the means of procuring Lord Plunkett's services. In speaking of the present Administration, it ought not to be forgotten that they acceded to office under circumstances more favourable to reform than had ever occurred before. At no preceding period had reform taken such an extensive and powerful hold of the public mind as at present. He felt no desire to oppose Ministers; but if he differed from them, he would speak his opinion freely and decidedly. He agreed with the hon. Baronet that it would be unworthy of a great nation to cut down with a parsimonious hand the salaries of individuals in subordinate offices. He entreated the Government, when they had dealt with their own salaries, not to visit the subordinate officers, he meant clerks, with the same severity which they might exercise with respect to themselves, for the little time he had been in office had taught him that what were called large emoluments were, in fact, small emoluments, and hardly sufficient to enable those persons to support themselves. Many of those individuals, after thirty or forty years' service, could not boast of having acquired an independence for their families.

Mr. *G. Bankes* said, that without meaning any disrespect to Lord Plunkett, he thought that Sir Anthony Hart was equally fitted for the office of Chancellor. He could see no reason for the translation of the former, whose services were already secured in another situation. It was a most singular thing, that the noble Secretary was himself a member of the very Administration by whom Sir A. Hart was appointed; and the same observation would apply to other members of the Government. How, then, he would ask the noble Lord, had Sir Anthony Hart forfeited the confidence of the present Government? Not only was the same Lord Lieutenant now going to Ireland that was there when Sir Anthony Hart was appointed, but the noble Secretary and other members of his Majesty's Government were then in office. What, then, was the ground of Sir Anthony Hart's removal? They were told that some plan of economy, that some system of reform, was in contemplation. An expense of 4,000*l.* a-year was to be entailed on the country—but still economy would be attended to. Now, he would ask, had

Ministers tried whether Sir Anthony Hart was adverse to their plan of economy? Because, if he were not, this 4,000*l.* a-year might have been gained, Sir Anthony Hart still remaining Chancellor, in addition to what would be produced by the intended reductions. He knew that length of service and bodily infirmity might, in some cases, be alleged to justify a retiring allowance. But he had not heard any such plea in this instance.

Colonel *Sibthorp* said, he had no desire to oppose the present Administration, but he wished to ask the noble Lord opposite whether the appointment of Comptroller of the Navy had been again filled up?—whether a new Clerk of the Council had been appointed since the death of Mr. Buller?—and whether an Ambassador was still to be maintained at Vienna, at an expense of 12,000*l.*? There were rumours abroad on these subjects which made him wish for positive information. The hon. member for Staffordshire had said, that the people would not grudge a few thousands extra, provided their servants were well paid; but they ought to know that their servants were not those right hon. and honourable Gentlemen who ran about all ways except the way they ought to go for the public good.

Lord *Althorp* said, that with respect to the situation of Comptroller of the Navy, he could not give the hon. Member any information. As to the appointment of second Clerk to the Council, he could give a satisfactory answer. Before the late Administration left office, the King's pleasure was taken on the appointment of Mr. Bathurst as second Clerk of the Council. His appointment was not made by the present Ministers, but by their predecessors. The only thing they had to do with the office was, to reduce the salary from 2,000*l.* to 1,200*l.* a-year. As to the embassy to Vienna, no change had taken place in it.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, that with respect to the Clerk of the Council, his Majesty's late Ministers had contemplated an arrangement when the office became vacant, which would have led to a reduction even more beneficial to the public, perhaps, than the present.

Mr. *R. Colborne* was friendly to a just economy, but he was sure that it would be found a very bad species of economy to under-pay public servants.

Mr. *Labouchere* wished to repeat the question which was put the other night by the hon. member for Bletchingly. He understood that no less than four pensions had been granted by the Duke of Wellington, or the late Administration, the date of which was subsequent to the virtual resignation of office by the noble Duke. He was desirous of learning how far this was correct. He could not but express his surprise that the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goulburn) had blamed the noble Lord (Althorp) who had so lately come into office, because he was not acquainted with the nature of a certain treaty, at the same time that the right hon. Gentleman had himself declared his entire ignorance of the point to which his (Mr. Labouchere's) question referred, although he certainly ought to have been informed on the subject.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, the hon. Member had no need to ask him this question, because one of the hon. Member's friends had moved for a return of those particular pensions, and it was now on the Table of the House. He had refused to answer the question formerly; because, with respect to a date, it was better to refer to a document than merely to trust to recollection. It appeared by the return, that the order for those pensions was dated the 16th of November.

Mr. *O'Connell* stated, that he had two reasons for not giving his opinion with respect to the judicial appointment which had been referred to. The first was, lest, in speaking on that subject, and expressing the deep and heartfelt interest which he took in the concerns of Ireland, he might be supposed to be actuated by a personal resentment, which he despised; the other reason was, that they had not all the facts at present before them.

Mr. *J. Johnston* said, he hoped that the proposed reforms of the Ministers would extend to Scotland, the representation of which was even more corrupt than that of England.

Motion agreed to.

The Committee was immediately appointed. Amongst its members are:—Lord Althorp, Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Goulburn, Mr. Bankes, Sir H. Parnell, Sir G. Warrender, Sir C. Wetherell, Marquis of Chandos, Sir T. Acland, Mr. Adeane, Mr. Bethel, Mr. Lawley, Sir H. Bunbury, Sir R. Vyvyan, Lord Stormont, Mr. Irving, Mr. Hume, Mr. Baring, Mr. J. Wood, Sir J. Newport, and Mr. Kennedy.

ELECTORS IN CITIES AND BOROUGHS.] Mr. *Hodgson* moved for a return of persons entitled to the freedom of certain specified Cities and Boroughs, by patrimony, servitude, or marriage, who have been admitted to such freedom in each of the last four years from the present time. The hon. Member explained, that he wished to find out the number of persons who had paid a stamp-duty, or taken out their freedom, with a view to ground on that a motion for the repeal of the stamp-duty.

Mr. *Croker* objected to the Motion, which would be unattended by any beneficial effects unless it was intended to abandon the stamp-duties on taking out freedoms.

Sir *C. Wetherell* said, the proper place to obtain the information required was the Stamp-office. The return, if granted, would not convey any satisfactory information on the subject. He opposed the Motion.

Mr. *G. Robinson* saw no reason to oppose the Motion, and as the returns might be beneficial he should support it. The stamp-duties, as he knew very well, prevented many freemen from taking up their freedom.

Mr. Bankes also expressed his approbation of the Motion.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, if the hon. Member's object was to get rid of the tax upon taking up freedoms, he should endeavour to effect it by easier and more direct means than a motion for voluminous and useless returns.

Mr. *Warburton* thought the returns would be very useful, and he should like to know the number of persons who took out their freedom.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* thought the hon. Member's object would be as well, or better attained, by a motion for the repeal of the tax at a proper time—a motion which should receive his support.

Mr. *Hodgson* consented to withdraw his motion, and expressed an intention to move for a repeal of the tax on a future opportunity. When he should bring that motion forward, he hoped he should not be accused of wishing to proceed in the dark because he had withdrawn his present motion.

COURT OF CHANCERY.] Mr. *Spence* observed, that the paper which he now sought to obtain was one that would be most necessary in the ensuing inquiries respecting Reform in the Court of Chancery. His object was, to effect reduction in the expenses of a suit in that Court, and to place the Court on the same footing as in the 40th of Elizabeth, when the number of officers there was amply sufficient for the purposes required. One of his plans was, to get rid of Recitals, and to incorporate Orders in the proceedings themselves. The document he required was absolutely necessary for his purposes. The hon. Member concluded by moving, "That the Clerk of the Rolls, or other proper Officer, lay before the House a Copy of the Presentment of John Shuckburgh, Thomas Poole, and others, chosen by the right hon. Thomas Egerton, Knight, Lord-Keeper of the Great Seal of England, to inquire and present upon articles for the better reformation of sundry exactions and abuses supposed to be committed by Officers, Clerks, and Ministers in his Majesty's High Court of Chancery, made the 8th day of March, in the fortieth year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth."

Sir *E. B. Sugden* did not oppose the Motion, as the hon. and learned Gentleman pledged himself to the necessity of having the document.

The *Attorney General* consented to the Motion. The document asked for was most important.

Sir *E. B. Sugden* reminded the House that he had intended to bring in a bill to regulate the practice of the Court of Chancery, and on Tuesday he should take the opportunity of stating what were his views on the subject.

Motion agreed to.

REGENCY BILL.] Lord *Althorp*, in moving the second reading of the Regency Bill, expressed his entire approbation of the measure, which appeared to him to be extremely well conceived. He did not consider that there was any infringement of the Constitution. There would be an infringement of the Constitution if a person with the sovereign power was deprived of his prerogative; if the prerogative were fit to be given to the Sovereign, it was also fit to be given to the person acting as Regent. He was glad, therefore, that this Bill appointed no Council of Regency, as had been done by former bills.

Sir *C. Wetherell* also gave his entire approbation to the principle of the measure, and observed, that the noble Lord who had introduced it to the other House had gained great honour by the clear and manly speech he made on that occasion; but he could not assent to the supposition that no case could arise in which a Council of Regency would be necessary. He contended, that in the event of the death of the King, leaving the Queen pregnant, the Crown should immediately descend on the Heir Presumptive. In that respect he approved of the principle of the Bill. He thought that the Act should be declaratory of the law that the Sovereignty should devolve on the Presumptive Heir at once. He should propose to add to the clause declaring that the Crown should so descend, these words:—"Her said royal highness shall be, and be deemed, and taken to be, and is hereby declared to be, the actual Sovereign of these realms, subject to the limitation hereinafter mentioned." There was one other deficiency in the Bill. In the event of the birth of a posthumous child of his present Majesty, the Bill did not provide for the cesser of the Sovereignty of the Princess Victoria. He should, therefore, propose to add these words: "That immediately on the birth of such child, the Sovereign title shall descend to him or her; and it is hereby declared, that the Princess Victoria's right shall cease and determine, and that such child shall be, and shall be deemed and taken to be, and is hereby declared to be, the lawful Sovereign of these realms, in the same manner as if he had succeeded the Princess Victoria in the possession of the Throne of these realms."

Mr. *Hughes Hughes* thought there was another omission in the Bill, and that was, that if the power of the Regent ceased there was no distinct provision made for the exercise of the powers of Sovereignty. He should move to supply that defect in the Committee.

Sir *E. B. Sugden* remarked, that his hon. and learned friend, who proposed to make that law a declaratory law, forgot that it was impossible to do so unless that and the other House of Parliament first agreed in a resolution that such as that hon. and learned Member wished to make the law was actually now the Law of the land. A declaratory law was only a declaration of a law actually pre-existing, but respecting which there had been some doubts. He was disposed to meet the learned Gentleman (Sir C. Wetherell) fairly and openly in the discussion on the clauses he had mentioned; but he confessed he thought the Bill perfect without them, and that Parliament was competent to deal with the cases alluded to whenever they arose, if they ever did arise at all.

Lord *Morpeth* expressed his entire approbation of the Bill. It was the happiness of the people at present to have a Sovereign on the Throne in whom they placed the most perfect confidence; but it was still more for their happiness that the laws of the realm did not trust its safety and security to any thing so unstable as human character.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* considered the Bill perfect, and the additional clauses consequently unnecessary. The noble Lord who framed and introduced it deserved the greatest praise for the whole Bill, and he should be sorry to see it undergo any alteration.

The *Attorney General* said, that any objection to the clauses might be urged with better effect when they came to consider the details in the committee. In his opinion the Bill at present accomplished what his hon. and learned friend wished.

Mr. *Campbell* said, that at present the law was not at all doubtful, and that he, therefore, should object to the clauses proposed by the hon. and learned member for Boroughbridge.

Lord *John Russell* approved of the principle of the Bill, and hoped it would pass with unanimity.

Bill read a second time, and ordered to be committed to-morrow.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, Dec. 10.

MINUTES.] The Royal Assent was given, by Commission, to the Consolidated Fund Bill.

Petitions presented. For the abolition of Slavery, by the Marquis of LANSDOWN, the Marquis of THOMOND, the Earl of ROSSLYN, and the Earl of ABERDEEN, from various Congregations of Dissenters in England, and from several places in Scotland. By the Marquis of LANSDOWN, from the Catholics in the parish of St. Peter, Athlone, praying for a better appropriation of the Funds voted for Education in Ireland; from the working Curriers of Dublin, complaining of Distress, and praying for a Repeal of the Union; from the Inhabitants of the parish of St. Nicholas, Dublin, for a reduction of the Duty on Sea-borne Coal; from Corkaguinny, Kerry, praying for a continuance of the bounties on Fish; for Parliamentary Reform, from the Town Council and Inhabitants of the Royal Burgh of Arbroath; from the Merchants' Company of Ayr; from the Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council of Ayr; from the Incorporated Guilds of Stirling; and from the Magistrates and Town Council of Forfar:—By the Earl of RADNOR, from the Inhabitants of Perth.

Distress.] The Earl of *Radnor* presented a petition which had been voted at a most numerous meeting held of the Vestry of the parish of St. Leonard, Shoreditch, in the month of June last, complaining of distress, and praying for a reduction of taxes, especially the taxes which pressed most severely upon the poorer orders of the community, such as the house and window taxes, and the taxes upon malt, sugar, &c. The petition further prayed, that the Church lands and tithes should be applied to defray the civil and military expenses of the State. The noble Lord remarked, that this petition was well worthy of the consideration and attention of their Lordships. It had been voted at a very numerous meeting, and it gave a frightful picture of the distress that prevailed in that parish, so far back as the month of June last. It stated that the parish contained 70,000 inhabitants and 7,000 houses; the whole rental amounted to 132,000*l.* and the poor-rates to 34,000*l.* a year. There was not one person in the parish who kept a carriage, and many of those who were obliged to pay to the poor-rates were compelled to deny themselves animal food. Since the meeting at which the petition was agreed to, the parish had been getting worse, and tradesmen who were in the habit of receiving 20*l.* a week did not now receive 20*s.* He had been informed by the person who had handed this petition to him, that the most frightful state of distress, and consequent demoralization existed at present in that parish,—a demoralization, which was not owing to the want of the means of spiritual instruction afforded to the people, but, as his informant had stated, to the dreadful poverty in which they were sunk. He produced this petition in answer to the challenge of the noble Duke (Wellington) last evening, who then called upon him to make any statement which would show that an inquiry had been called for on the part of his Majesty's late Government. Here was an instance of distress which existed in June last, long previous to the dissolution of the late Ministry. Several such instances had been mentioned to their Lordships last Session. It therefore appeared to him that it would be a mere farce if Ministers should thus shut their eyes to what was passing before them. They should have known the existence of such distress; and if they did not know of it, they should have inquired about it; and if they were aware of its existence, and did not take any measures to remedy it, their conduct was still more deserving of reprobation. A responsible Government was a mere farce, if things, such as he had stated, which were passing within three miles of the house in which he was speaking, should not have been inquired into, and if no attention was given to the applications of the people for relief. That was his charge against the late Government.

The Duke of *Wellington* was sure, that the noble Lord who had just sat down would have the candour to say, that when he stated, last night, that he would, if he had a seat in the other House, bring forward a motion for a committee of inquiry to ascertain whether it was fit to impeach the persons who had served his Majesty in the late Administration,—the noble Lord would surely have the candour to allow, that when he made that statement, he did not advert to the distress which existed in the parish of St. Leonard, Shoreditch, or in any parish in the kingdom, or in all of them together. What the noble Lord then said was, that the country was in a difficult and dangerous situation—that the Government which succeeded the late Administration had found the country involved in a difficult and dangerous situation, and that the Members of the late Administration were responsible for that, and they ought to be impeached for it. He had said in answer to that statement at the time, and he should now repeat it, that he called upon the noble Lord to bring forward a distinct charge against his Majesty's late Administration, and he should be ready to meet it, and defend his Majesty's late Government against whatever charge the noble Lord might think proper to prefer against them. The noble Lord now brought forward a petition from the parish of St. Leonard, Shoreditch, and he made a statement, not founded on the petition, but upon the assertions of a nameless person, whose assertions he backed with his authority; and he then said, that his Majesty's late Government was responsible for the distress which existed in that parish in the month of June last. For himself he had stated before, and he would repeat it, that he never could, or would, make himself responsible for any act that was not his own, or for any thing which it was not his duty to see put to rights. He would maintain that he had nothing to do with the management of the poor in the parish of St. Leonard, Shoreditch, even if they were twenty times worse off and worse managed than had been stated. The King's Ministers were not responsible for the suffering or distress in that parish or this parish. They were not responsible for that which it was not their duty to set right. The noble Lords opposite, who had taken upon them the Government of the country, must see that they could do nothing in such a way as that. They might subscribe, and recommend his Majesty to subscribe, in such cases, but it would be found that the late Ministers did the same, and that his late Majesty subscribed as much as he could. It was not in the power of Ministers, and it would not be legal for them, to interfere in any other way in such matters. If the noble Lord could bring forward a distinct charge against his Majesty's late Ministers, he (the Duke of Wellington) should be ready at any time to meet it.

Earl *Stanhope* maintained that the cause of the distress which prevailed now, was only to be found in the measures of that House, which had refused to inquire into the distresses of the people. That distress had existed for a long time, it existed throughout the country, and had been frequently, both by him and other noble Lords, brought under their Lordships' notice. The distress was not the consequence of local but general causes, and he was extremely sorry to find that the present Ministry had adopted the views of the late Ministry, and meant to refuse inquiry. He had been informed by a dignitary of the Established Church, resident in Sussex, that the resistance offered by the Ministry last night to the motion of the noble and learned Lord would occasion great disappointment and be most calamitous in its results. In his opinion he coincided, and would on no account take on himself the responsibility the Ministry had incurred by refusing to grant the inquiry moved for.

Lord *King* said, that no such preposterous charge had been preferred against the noble Duke by the noble Earl (Radnor), as that he, when Minister, should have superintended the management of the Poor-laws in any particular parish. What the noble Lord had said was, that the cause of timely relief not being afforded, was ascribable to the noble Duke, who had put into the mouth of his Sovereign, at the beginning of the last Session, the statement that only "partial distress" existed. The disgust and irritation which that untoward language produced throughout the country compelled the Ministers to make those reductions of the taxes which they afterwards made, and which, in his conscience, he (Lord King) believed that they never intended at the beginning of that Session to make, or they would never have put into the mouth of the King such unfortunate and exasperating language,—language which was only paralleled by the strange and infatuated declaration which had expelled the noble Duke and his colleagues from power.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, that the noble Lord lay under a complete mistake as to the reduction which had been made in the taxes. That reduction was made in consequence of the repeated reductions of expenditure which had been effected in the course of three consecutive Sessions of Parliament, and in consequence of the great reduction, amounting actually to more than a million sterling, which had been made in the interest of the National Debt. That reduction in the interest of the National Debt was effected in the last Session of Parliament; but until it was completed, it was impossible for the Government to make any reductions in the taxes, nor could they decide which it was their duty to reduce; and that duty was not performed until the moment came for making the reductions.

Lord *King* did not think that he was at all mistaken as to the cause which had compelled the late Ministers to effect such a reduction of the taxes. There was nothing of which people in such a situation as the late Ministers filled were so fond of as a large margin, and he was sure that the noble Duke would have kept the large margin if he could, and that he would have employed it against those "deplorable events" of which the noble Duke had spoken last night, if it had not been taken from him. He was convinced that the noble Duke would have kept the large margin if he could, and that, if he had remained in power, he would in that case have done something against those events which he had last night so much lamented.

The Earl of *Rosslyn* said, it was extraordinary that the noble Lord should persist in an assertion which he must know was contrary to the truth,—namely, that the late Ministers did not intend to reduce the taxes at the commencement of the last Session of Parliament. The fact was, that the details were then all prepared, and as soon as the reduction of the interest of the four-per-cents had been effected, the intended reductions in the taxes were made.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* said, that the course which his Majesty's late Ministers had pursued, in doing every thing to prevent inquiry into the distresses of the people, had met with the reprobation of every well-wisher to the country. If an inquiry had been granted last Session, he was of opinion that the present disturbed state of the country would not have existed at this moment, and he would assert, that in that case the spirit of disaffection which existed amongst the great body of the people towards the Legislature of the country, for turning a deaf ear to their complaints, would not be in existence. Such he was certain would have been the good effects which we should now witness if the Legislature had then entered upon an inquiry into the distresses and grievances of the people. He denied that the present Ministers were taking the same course as that followed by the late Ministers, for they had already granted an inquiry into the state of the Poor-laws, which inquiry he firmly believed would be productive of great advantage to the country, and they had pledged themselves to apply their attention to the state of the country generally. He must say, that he had been quite convinced by the arguments used by the noble Earl (Grey) last night, against the expediency of the kind of inquiry which was then called for.

Earl *Stanhope*, in explanation, said, that the present Ministers were imitating their predecessors in refusing inquiry.

The Marquis of *Clanricarde* said, that the question at issue last Session was, whether the distress was partial, as had been alleged by Ministers, or whether it was general, as it really was, and as every one out of doors believed it to be. Though he supported the Motion for inquiry last Session, he did not deem it at all inconsistent, under existing circumstances, to oppose the Motion made last night for inquiry. That Motion went to a full inquiry into every interest of the State, and it was made when Parliament was about to rise for the recess, when one committee had been appointed and when the Government, far from denying the distress, admitted it, and had pledged itself to consider the subject. He was in hopes that in a few weeks the Government would redeem that pledge, but thinking the inquiry proposed last night much too extensive, he had voted against it.

The Earl of *Radnor* explained. The difference between the late and the present Administration was this,—that the late Administration refused inquiry, and denied the existence of distress, while the present Administration admitted the existence of distress, and said that they would apply their minds to find a remedy for it, while, at the same time, they granted a committee of inquiry into the state of the Poor-laws. The noble Duke had said again to-night, that he (the Earl of Radnor) might bring a specific charge against the late Ministers if he chose. He, however, would repeat what he had said last night, that he should do no such thing; for that his only object in bringing such a charge would be, to remove the noble Duke and his colleagues from power, and that, fortunately, was already done. As to the intention of the late Ministers to reduce taxation, since the noble Duke and the noble Earl below him had declared that they had positive knowledge of such intention, independent of the cry of distress that was raised, he certainly, without any knowledge upon the subject, could not assert that no such intention existed. However, the general belief of the country was, that the Ministers were forced into those reductions by the cry that was raised in the other House; and if such intention existed, he could only say, that the deplorable prospect presented to them at the opening of the Session was the more remarkable. Besides, nothing could be more astonishing, with this view of the subject, than the lamentable exhibition which the Chancellor of the Exchequer made last Session—nearly all the financial measures except the Beer-bill having failed or been withdrawn: and if, therefore, the Ministers had really matured their plans, and could, nevertheless, make no better appearance than they did make, the country had another reason to rejoice at the removal of those Ministers.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, that he had voted against the committee last night, and against the committee proposed while he was in the Government for the same reason,—namely, that he thought them both useless. Noble Lords might talk from this time till to-morrow, and still they could not deny that the late Administration had done all they could. Was the Beer bill nothing? Was the reduction of 3,000,000*l.* of taxation nothing? He did think that the late Government was a little ill-used when these measures were forgotten. He repeated, that the late Ministers, seeing that they could reduce expenditure, and that they should be able to reduce the interest of the four-per-cents, had always determined to reduce taxation, and that the reductions they had made were not forced upon them, but had been all along contemplated by them. The measures which the noble Earl had mentioned as having been withdrawn, were those respecting the Spirit-duties and the Sugar-duties; but these merely effected a transfer, and not a reduction, of taxation. As to it not being known that reductions were intended, he begged to remind the noble Earl, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer made his financial statement as early as six weeks, he believed, after the meeting of Parliament. For this,—for allowing the Chancellor of the Exchequer to take that course,—he was ready to take great blame to the Government, for he was convinced that many of the difficulties with which the Government had had to contend, arose from their permitting the Chancellor of the Exchequer to come forward so early with his financial statement. He would take this opportunity of observing, that although he did not wish to take away any merit from the present Government,—indeed he was ready to give that Government all the assistance he could consistently with his sense of duty, and no man was less inclined to throw obstructions in its way than he was,—he would take this opportunity of observing, that the Poor-laws' Committee, which had been so often said to be a measure of the present Government, was actually consented to by him, as he was sure his noble friend who moved for that committee would admit. He thought this conversation very uncalled for, and would only repeat, that he was ready to meet any charge that might be brought against him.

Lord *Wharncliffe* thought, that the case of the parish of St. Leonard, Shoreditch—which was a parish peculiarly situated—had nothing to do with the charge which the noble Earl (Radnor) had brought last night against the late Government. Whatever might be the condition of such a parish, it would not make out the position of the noble Earl, that the late Ministers ought to be impeached. With regard to motions for committees for general inquiry, these were mere delusions: they were very good means in the hands of persons who desired to embarrass a Government, but even the persons who originated them never dreamed that they would come to anything. He thought that the noble Duke might safely appeal to the acts of his Administration,—to the Test Act,—to the Catholic Relief Bill,—to the Beer Bill,—as proofs that he had done all he could. Though he had opposed the noble Duke where he had found it his duty to oppose him, he was ready to admit, that the noble Duke had done much, and that what he had done ought not to be forgotten. The noble Earl (Stanhope) at the Table said, that he himself could have done more. Yes, he knew that the noble Earl had a *nostrum* in his pocket; but allow him to tell the noble Earl, that the country would not take the medicine. The *nostrum* was merely an alteration in the currency, and it had been refuted over and over again in this, as well as in the other House of Parliament, until people were tired of exposing the mischiefs of it. He admitted that the present Administration had more power than the late Administration had to benefit the country; but he did not believe that the late Administration was inferior to the present in good intentions.

Petition to lie on the Table.

SLAVERY IN THE COLONIES.] Lord *Napier* presented a petition against the continuance of Negro Slavery; and in doing so took the opportunity of referring to the proposition he had made on a former night, that a Committee of their Lordships should go out to the West-India Islands, in order to furnish the House with the best information upon the question of negro slavery, before they undertook to legislate upon it. Before he made that proposition he had had no communication whatever with anybody upon the subject. He had no West-India property, he never had had any, and he never expected to have any; but still he felt interested on the subject, from the knowledge of the colonies which his professional life had given him. Since he made the proposition to which he now referred, he had had communications with different gentlemen connected with those places, and he found that they much approved of his plan. As there were several noble Lords who strongly supported the question of the manumission of slaves, no doubt, whenever the country called on them to undertake the duty of going out as a Committee of Inquiry, to examine into the subject, they would show their perfect readiness to obey the call. He had never once expressed his opinion on the matter, but he would now do so, and would state distinctly, that in his mind slavery in all its branches was a curse, and a heavy curse; but how to remove it was a question which their Lordships could never learn to answer properly in this country alone. Their Lordships must remember, that the colonies were composed of islands taken from other countries during the war, as well as of those which had long been in possession of this country; and he would defy their Lordships, by any regulation they might make here, to embrace all the different interests that existed in these various islands. It was impossible they could justly understand all these differences, unless they sent out a body of their own Members thither. He was ready, for one, to become a member of that committee; and he was satisfied, that when this appeal was made to those noble Lords to whom he had before alluded, they would come forward and show their readiness to give their services in favour of the cause they had so often advocated, or, if they did not, they must for ever after hold their peace.

Earl *Stanhope* did not rise to oppose the motion for laying this petition on the Table, but merely to make a suggestion in accordance with that thrown out by the noble Lord who had just taken his seat. The suggestion was, that if the committee mentioned by the noble Lord should be appointed, the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack was of all others the most fitted to be sent out as its chairman. He made that proposal because, if he remembered rightly, that noble and learned Lord, in the very first speech which he made in that House, declared most solemnly, that one of the two questions which he considered to be of paramount importance was that of the abolition of slavery. It was not, therefore, improbable that the noble and learned Lord might consider the going to the West Indies, in order to assist in the abolition of negro slavery, as one of the paramount duties of his new office. The noble and learned Lord had distinctly asserted the paradox which he (Earl Stanhope) had just mentioned. He would not enter into any argument as to the truth of that paradox, but would merely observe, that it was like saying, when the homestead was on fire it should be considered a paramount duty on the part of the farmer to hasten to extinguish the flames that threatened to burst out in a stack in a distant part of the farm.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, I am fully sensible, my Lords, as well from experience here as elsewhere, how very inconvenient a long, tiresome, and somewhat irregular discussion must always be,—and in spite, my Lords, even of the charms of the noble Earl's eloquence, I cannot help regretting the time we have lost in the late discussion. Your Lordships may be perfectly secure, therefore, that I shall not give rise to another such, but I am sure your Lordships will agree that I could not help rising, after the very pointed allusion which the noble Earl has made to me. The noble Earl has, in a very good-humoured manner, alluded to what he considers a most extraordinary paradox. [*Hear! from Earl Stanhope.*] Oh yes, my Lords, I am perfectly well aware that the noble Earl will always stand up for what he has once laid down, and that even after it has been proved to be absurd,—after every one else has admitted the absurdity of it,—the noble Earl will still stand up for it—ay, stand up and speak for it as often as your Lordships like, and perhaps a little oftener. However, my Lords, I have been called upon to explain a paradox which the noble Earl considers to be the most extraordinary possible, and which he thinks to be deserving of the reprobation of all wise men,—probably, because he feels that it is deserving of his own reprobation. The noble Earl says, that I have declared negro slavery to be a subject of paramount importance to this country; and he says, that to make such a declaration is as ridiculous as to say that we ought to go abroad to prevent a distant misfortune when our house is on fire at home. Now, my Lords, it is very possible that I may have been unfortunate in the choice of an expression; that I may have selected an extraordinary, an ill-adapted, an unnecessarily strong—nay, an extravagant epithet; but that, my Lords, is a mishap that befalls all men at times, and especially when speaking about subjects upon which their feelings and their conviction are most strong; nay, my Lords, this even happens sometimes to the noble Earl himself, who, however chaste his eloquence undoubtedly is, does sometimes indulge in the use of epithets, which, if one considers them very closely, do not always appear the most appropriate. However, my Lords, what I meant when I said that this subject was one of paramount importance to the country, was this,—I meant, that let our distresses be ever so great, let the disturbances which prevail at home be ever so much to be deplored, still it is the province of a wise, and, permit me to add, of a just Government, to fulfil the duty of justice rather than of mercy; and I call that a subject of paramount importance which involves the fulfilment of the sacred duty of justice—a duty that is never to be evaded, and the non-performance of which can never be excused by any condition of unhappiness, no matter how great, at home. Well, my Lords, so much for the use of the epithet which has scandalized the correct and critical judgment of the noble Earl. Then, my Lords, the noble Earl went on in a most facetious manner to contend, that I, and that I only, ought to be chairman of a committee which I have learnt to night, for the first time, that your Lordships are about to appoint, and to despatch upon a voyage to the West-India Islands. How this committee is to be constituted we have not heard. I hope it is not to consist of the present Ministers, nor do I wish so ill to the noble Lords near me,—the ex-ministers,—as to desire that they should be sent on such a mission: but, my Lords, if you will take the authority of the noble Earl, be the committee constituted as it may, I am the only fit person to be chairman of it. Now, my Lords, far be it from me to presume to say, that the noble Earl is not quite right in this matter; only your Lordships will, I am sure, see that it is my duty to suggest to you that I might be missed at home. It is not unlikely, my Lords, that the suitors in Chancery might object to the course proposed by the noble Earl; they might be unreasonable enough to think, that although their houses would not be on fire, yet they might be altogether dismantled while I was voyaging to the Indies, and that although they would stand in no great degree of danger of being burned, yet they might happen to starve during the absence of the Lord Chancellor on such an expedition. This, my Lords, might be the view which the Chancery suitors would take of the matter; and as it is obvious that there is nothing too unreasonable for them to be guilty of, after having committed the offence of differing from the noble Earl, it is not improbable that they may borrow from the noble Earl himself those excellent observations which the noble Earl has made to-night about paradoxes. However, if the noble Earl thinks that I am worthy to be consulted in the matter—if, by what he has said, the noble Earl meant to ask my opinion as to the propriety of my being chairman of such a committee, I will tell him candidly that I cannot yet satisfy him upon that point. Whether I go or stay will depend very much upon who are to go with me. I must inquire into that first; and, to begin, let me ask the noble Earl if he intends to make one of the party;—let me ask the noble Earl whether he will go with me, and, if he will, whether I may calculate upon the pleasure of hearing seven or eight speeches from him, upon the same subject,—they must be upon the same subject in the space of four-and-twenty hours; and whether the noble Earl will promise, that they shall all of them be as entertaining and as instructive as three or four speeches made upon the presentation of a petition, but having no connexion whatever with the subject of that petition? I wish to know, before I decide, whether I am to enjoy the pleasure of such intellectual amusements. I wish to know whether the noble Earl will take care to get himself embarked in the same bottom as myself, for that is essential, as I am sure your Lordships will see. I wish to know and to be assured as to these facts, and I therefore put it to the noble Earl whether he is ready to give me security,—such security as may be approved by two Masters in Chancery,—and enter into recognizances that he will go in the same ship with me, and undertake to debate everything that occurs on the voyage, or that does not occur on the voyage, but may happen to suggest itself to the noble Earl,—whether the noble Earl will thus debate, and whether, moreover, he will carry on that debate in that feeble voice of which he complained last night [*cries of "No, no," from Earl Stanhope*]. I beg the noble Earl's pardon; he certainly said last night, that "he raised his feeble voice, and wished to express forcibly;" such were the noble Earl's epithets; it is not for me to say whether the noble Earl in his speech attended to that definition which an eminent critic has given of fine writing, and which the noble Earl will probably see, is equally applicable to fine speaking,—namely, "apt words in apt places:" it is not for me, my Lords, to say whether the noble Earl attended to this definition, or whether he put the epithets in the wrong places, fixing "feeble" where "forcible" ought to have been, and "forcible" where "feeble" would have been more appropriate—it is not, I say, my Lords, for me to pronounce on this matter, but such were most assuredly the epithets of the noble Earl; and as he has been so hypercritical upon one of my epithets, he cannot surely complain of my also turning critic upon his. Well, then, my Lords, as I was saying,—will the noble Earl give me good and sufficient security that he will embark himself in the same ship with myself,—I will not insist upon his fixing his birth in the same cabin;—that he will speak during the voyage such speeches as he speaks here, with the same iteration, in the same feeble tone, and with the same agreeable absence of reasoning and argument? Will the noble Earl, I say, secure to me well and sufficiently, and legally, these advantages,—all these advantages, for I will abate none of them? If the noble Lord will, and will inform me also who the others are who are to go with us—how we are to voyage, and what we are to do when we reach the end of our voyage,—then, and not till then, for then only shall I be in possession of all the circumstances of the case,—then, I say, I will, like a good and just Judge, decide whether I will go or stay. I am sure your Lordships will see that I should ill become the high judicial office which I fill, if I were to give judgment in such a case before the noble Earl has satisfied me on these points, for until then I shall not have learned all the facts of the matter before me; and, without being informed of these, it is quite impossible that I can give a sound and satisfactory decision.

Petition to lie on the Table.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, Dec. 10.

Minutes.] A Member took the Oaths at the Table of the House.

The Committee appointed to inquire into the Election of Boroughbridge reported, that Sir C. Wetherell, Knt. and Matthias Attwood, Esq., were duly elected for that Borough; and that the Petition of their Opponents was not frivolous or vexatious.

Bills. Mr. Severn brought in one to amend the Stage Coaches Act.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. R. Pusey, accounts of all terminable Annuities forming part of the National Debt:—On the Motion of Mr. S. Rice, the sums of Money expended in building Londonderry Bridge, pursuant to the Act 54 Geo. 3rd, c. 230.

Petitions presented. Against Negro Slavery, by Sir George Robinson, two from Dissenting Congregations in Northampton and Cherwell:—By Mr. Adeane, two from Dissenting Congregations in Cambridgeshire:—By Sir W. Ingilby, from Holbeach, Spalding, and Gainsborough:—By Mr. Abel Smith, from Female Methodists near Lincoln's-inn-Fields:—By Lord J. Stuart, from Cardiff, and from a Parish in Wales:—By Mr. Beaumont, three from Hexham, and other places in Northumberland:—By Mr. Hope, from Linlithgow:—By the Marquis of Blandford, from Dissenters of Langford:—By Mr. Long Wellesley, Mr. R. Grant, Colonel Craddock, and the Attorney General, from Dissenters of Bristol, Portsea, Thaxted, Nottingham, Paisley, and Edinburgh. For the repeal of the Malt and Hop Duties, by Mr. Hodges, from Wrotham and Staplehurst, Kent. By the same hon. Member, from Cranbrook, Woodchurch, and Horsemonden, for a Reform in Parliament. By the Marquis of Blandford, from Woodstock, with the same Prayer; and from Diss, for Relief. By Mr. Owen O'Connor, from certain Freeholders of Galway, for the extension of the Elective Franchise; and from an individual, for a Repeal of the Union. By Mr. O'Connell, from Limerick, Knockmoy, and Youghall, with the same prayer; from parishes in the County of Sligo, against the Kildare-street Society; and from the Union of Middleton, for the abolition of Tithes. By Mr. O'Gorman Mahon, from Kilfinora, against the Kildare-street Society.

Local Courts of Judicature.] Mr. *Charles Russell* presented a Petition from Reading, praying that the bill now pending in the Lords for the establishment of Local Courts might be passed into a law. The petition was numerously signed, and would have been signed by every inhabitant in Reading if more time had been allowed. He cordially concurred in the prayer of the petition, and believed that the bill, if passed into a law, would do a great deal of good, by preventing delay, vexation, and expense in obtaining justice. It would be an especial benefit to the working and poorer classes, and should receive from him the warmest support when it came into that House.

Colonel *Sibthorp* presented a similar petition from Lincoln. The great expense at present of law proceedings was a serious injury to all the middle classes, particularly to tradesmen. He rejoiced that one whose talents he admired, and whose loss to that House he deplored—he rejoiced that the noble and learned Lord meant to carry forward the reforms in the law which he had first proposed in that House.

Mr. *O'Connell* was extremely anxious to call the attention of the petitioners to the fact, that although the principle of local judicature was excellent, and of the most ancient practice, yet in the details of the bill introduced into the other House, there would be found many objections, such as the complexity of its provisions, and the utter impossibility of one man combining all the duties imposed upon him by the bill. These things would in a great measure prevent the bill being beneficial, but he still approved of it as an experiment, though he would advise petitioners to be cautious how they wished to extend the operations of the system until they found its effects by experience.

Colonel *Sibthorp* said, that the petition was signed by several gentlemen, eminent in the profession of which the learned Gentleman near him (Mr. O'Connell) was so distinguished a member. An easy access to justice had been too long denied to the people; and he could not agree that it was better to delay still longer for the sake of such a measure as the learned Member might approve.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that he well knew that legal reform had been too long delayed; and all that he desired was, that, when granted, it should be effectual. He did not wish to discourage the petitioners, but he must repeat, that they would not find the proposed measure so efficacious as they expected.

ASSESSED TAXES.] Colonel *Sibthorp* presented a Petition from Lincoln, praying for the Repeal of the Assessed Taxes, complaining of them as unconstitutional and oppressive, and declaring that they ought not to be continued in the eighteenth year of peace. The hon. Member stated, that the petition was signed by 1,272 persons, including most of the principal inhabitants and tradesmen of the town. He concurred in the prayer of the petition, and would like very much to know what the Chancellor of the Exchequer meant to do. He objected in particular to the tax on houses, and wished to see the collectors of these taxes diminished. If the hon. Alderman, who had given notice for a motion on the subject of these taxes, did not bring the subject under the consideration of Parliament he would very soon after the recess.

Mr. *Ellis* thought it premature to support a petition by such observations as had fallen from the hon. Member, as it was well known that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was not then in the House, had the subject under his consideration.

Petition to be printed.

REFORM OF PARLIAMENT.] Sir *W. Ingilby* presented a Petition from Gainsborough, praying for a Reform. The hon. Member observed, that this was almost the first from the county of Lincoln on this important subject, and would by no means be the last. He rejoiced to state, that the spirit of reform, now spreading through the country, was every day becoming more and more apparent, as the necessity for it became more and more urgent. These petitions came from a numerous and independent body of the people, and they especially prayed for the annihilation of the rotten boroughs, and for vote by ballot. He felt very great pleasure in presenting them to the House, and in cordially supporting their prayer.

Mr. Beaumont presented a similar petition from North Shields.

Mr. *Bell* said, that the petition had not resulted from a public meeting, but had been got up privately. He objected to the petition, because one passage of it asserted, that if a rational reform were not granted, the people would take it by violence. That did not express the sentiments of the people of Northumberland, for the population of that county was peaceable, and not at all disposed to seek reform or improvement of any kind by measures of violence, or by any but the most legal and constitutional measures. In that statement he was sure that his hon. colleague would concur.

Mr. *Beaumont* said, that the passage did not allude to the people of Northumberland, but to the people of England in general. He would put one question to his hon. colleague. Did he or did he not believe that the people of North Shields were favourable to reform?

Petition to be printed.

Mr. *Hodges* in presenting several Petitions from different parishes in the county of Kent, praying for Reform in Parliament, and a reduction of Taxation, said, that he quite agreed in the prayer of these petitions, and he hoped that prayer would be granted, at least in part. With repect to the mode of reform, that was not the occasion to deliver his opinions, but hoping that he should not excite the angry feelings of any hon. Gentleman, in the same manner as the hon. and learned member for Waterford did last night, he must say, that he sincerely concurred in his admiration of the vote by ballot. Whatever reform his Majesty's Ministers might think proper to propose, they would not, he hoped, omit to introduce the ballot; without which the interests of the people could not be secured. He was happy to have it in his power to state, that the recent change in the Administration had operated most favourably on the minds of the people. He had received a letter that morning from a most respectable and valuable Magistrate of the county of Kent, in which he stated, that under the late Administration, when it became necessary, in consequence of the disturbances that had occurred, to swear in a number of Special Constables, he could get nobody to be sworn; but since the change in the Administration, the respectable inhabitants had come forward in great numbers, and were now as anxious to uphold the peace of the county as they were before to stand aloof. That was a most important fact; and he trusted that it would prove an additional inducement to his Majesty's Ministers, to bring forward measures to promote the benefit of the country.

An *Hon. Member* begged leave to address one word to the House on that part of the speech of the hon. member for Kent in which he stated, that several persons had refused to act, under the late Administration for the suppression of outrages. Was it fitting or proper that these gentlemen should consider themselves authorized to withhold their assistance under one particular Government, and afford it under another? He regretted that there should be any set of men in this country so neglectful of their duty; for, be their opinion what it might, it was their bounden duty to stand forward for the suppression of outrage and tumult. He hoped that those gentlemen who did thus improperly refuse to render their assistance, would now uphold the peace of the country with double vigilance and double perseverance; and by doubly watching over its interests, that they would endeavour, in some measure, to retrieve the character they had so nearly lost.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* expressed his surprise at the statement of the hon. member for Kent, and he must beg leave to say, that those of his constituents who refused to be sworn in as Special Constables during the continuance of the late Administration, completely abandoned the duty which as Englishmen they owed to their country. He hoped that the hon. member for Kent would tell his constituents, that when a man is called upon to maintain the peace of any particular district, he is not to say, "I will maintain it under this set of Ministers, and I will not maintain it under that." He hoped that the hon. Member would tell them that they were violators of that principle which every man should act upon,—that they were defaulters in the payment of that debt which every man owed to his country—that the maintenance of the public peace was a duty—that they were to act like private individuals as they are, and not make themselves tools or partisans of any Government. He trusted that the House would not consider such a statement as any argument in favour of the measure of reform, for the repeal of the malt-tax, or for the redress of grievances. Such arguments were subversive of the Constitution. He could not sufficiently admire the presumption and impertinence of these persons, as if they were authorised to decline assisting in the preservation of the public peace, because one set of men or another set of men happened to be in Office. He hoped, however, that the constituents of the hon. member for Kent would henceforward do their duty, and that he would never again state in that House circumstances so disgraceful to his constituents.

Mr. *Hodges* did not mean to follow the course pointed out by the hon. and learned Gentleman, by reading his constituents a severe lecture. Instead of lecturing them, it would be better if he were to endeavour to confirm them in their present opinions. He trusted that the present Ministry would do their duty, and by that means effectually prevent disaffection and outrage. With respect to the conduct of the Magistrates in the county of Kent, he would take the liberty of referring to an Address, a Memorial sent to the late Prime Minister by the Grand Jury of the county of Kent. In that memorial, addressed to the Duke of Wellington, it was said,

> "We feel, that in justice we ought not to suffer a moment to pass away without communicating to your Grace, the great and unprecedented distress which, we are enabled from our own present experience to state, prevails among all the peasantry to a degree not only dreadful to individuals, but also to an extent which, if not checked, must be attended with serious consequences to the national prosperity. In making this communication to your Grace, it is our only object to call the attention of the Government to the real state of the country, and in the hope that effectual measures may be taken to alleviate distresses which press so heavily and severely on all classes of society."

This memorial was signed by every gentleman on the Grand Jury, and was not unworthy of the attention of the House. Eleven out of the twenty-three Grand Jurymen were candidates for the honour of a seat in Parliament, and the remainder were gentlemen of the first respectability. If that memorial had been attended to, not one of the disgraceful scenes which had recently occurred would have taken place in Kent. In all probability, if the present Administration had then been in power they never would have occurred.

Petition to lie upon the table.

PARLIAMENTARY GRANTS FOR EDUCATION—(IRELAND).] Mr. *Owen O'Connor* presented Petitions against any further grant to the Kildare Street Society, for the Education of the Poor in Ireland, from Kilglass, Balla and Drum, Kilfinora, and the united parishes of Aglish, Ballyhear, and Breafy. The contents of all these petitions, the hon. Member said, were the same; they all complained of the various abuses which existed in the management of the Kildare Street Society. He considered these petitions well deserving of the attention of the House. He had often heard, that this Society had proved a great benefit to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, but he must confess, that he never met with any proof of that assertion. He trusted, that his Majesty's Ministers would take this subject into consideration, and adopt measures to make the grants, which are given exclusively to this Society, of advantage to all Ireland.

Sir *Robert Bateson* said, several petitions on this subject had been presented to the House, signed by bigotted and interested persons, which he had not thought it worth while to comment upon, although they contained allegations which it was in his power to disprove; but, when he saw petitions of this nature presented by so respectable and worthy a Gentleman as he who introduced these to the notice of the House, he should not be fulfilling the duties which he owed to his constituents, and his country generally, if he did not stand up to protest against the doctrines contained in them. The hon. Member could not be aware of the general principles which governed the acts of that Society; and if he rightly understood the rule of conduct it pursued, he could not possibly object to the management of the grants bestowed upon the Society by Parliament. So far from being established for the encouragement of any particular religious persuasion — so far from its advocating any one particular cause, the only fault ever found with the Society, though he did not think it a fault—was, that it was too liberal in its religious principles. The Society had been grossly maligned, and an ignorant prejudice had been excited against it, by persons who had been hawking petitions about the country for signature. He knew no institution whatever that had been productive of so much good as the Kildare-place Society in instructing the lower orders of Ireland, and he must repel the charge of its schools not being open to every sect. He could most positively state, that the benefits of that institution were conferred in an equal degree on Catholics and on Protestants, and he conscientiously believed, that more Roman Catholic schoolmasters, and more Roman Catholic children, had been educated and brought up by that Society than Protestants. The strongest objection stated by the petitioners was, that the Scriptures were read in the Society's school without note or comment. Was there any Gentleman in the House who would stand up and object to the Bible being open to the perusal of the people? When hon. Gentlemen were somewhat fond of boasting of their liberal principles, which, by-the-bye, they did not, in these times, always act upon, was it not astonishing to hear Gentlemen declare, that the people, either of England or Ireland, ought not to be allowed to peruse the word of God without note or comment. He did not expect to hear such a declaration made in any place, but the House of Commons of England was the very last place in which he thought such a doctrine would be broached. He did not impute improper motives to the hon. Gentleman who presented these petitions; on the contrary, he merely stated the language of his constituents, as in duty bound. These petitions were, however, got up by bigoted and interested individuals, desirous of putting down this excellent institution, and were readily signed by a set of people who knew nothing of its principles—nothing of the manner in which the Society was conducted, who never read any of the books used by it, and who never were even within the walls of its schools. He hoped and trusted that the Parliament of the United Kingdom would protect that Society, and not diminish the grants, which confer benefit equally on Catholics and Protestants. As to the manner in which the funds are appropriated, there was no institution in the empire in which greater economy was practised, and in which less useless expense took place, than in the Kildare-place Society. Representing a county in the north of Ireland, and knowing a great deal of the principles of the people of the north of Ireland, the majority of whom were of the Presbyterian Church, he could take upon himself to state, that into schools in which the Bible was not read without note or comment, their children would not be allowed to enter. They wished their children to be instructed in the word of God, and made good Christians, as well as educated in the affairs of this life. The Kildare-street Society enjoyed the good wishes of all the Presbyterian clergy in the north of Ireland. He challenged any country in the world to produce a more useful institution. When persons were sent up to the central school, their religion was never inquired into, the majority of them were Catholics, and they taught the duties of a schoolmaster or schoolmistress. They were remunerated, not in proportion to the number of children placed under their care, but in proportion to the progress the children made; to ascertain which, inspectors were appointed, who went about the school, and made their reports on the state of improvement in which they found the children. He most earnestly implored the House not to credit the asseverations contained in those petitions; they were not founded in fact, and he most earnestly implored those Gentlemen who might have taken up a prejudice against the charity, to pause before they took away from his poor countrymen the benefit conferred by this institution. He had to apologize to the House for trespassing so long on its attention; perhaps the hon. and learned member for Waterford would wish to monopolize the consideration of the affairs of his country, and to exclude every other Irishman from discussing its interests; he was, however, as independent, and as much attached to Ireland, as the hon. and learned Member, who might more usefully direct the energies of his great mind to the improvement of his country, than by constantly harping on the Repeal of the Union, which would, in his opinion, amount to a total separation of the two countries. In conclusion, the hon. Baronet begged to apologise for having trespassed so long on the attention of the House.

Mr. *O'Connell* was not to be tempted into following the hon. Baronet, the member for Londonderry, into a discussion on the merits of the Kildare-street Society—"sufficient for the day is the evil thereof." He merely wished to observe, that as to the utility of the Kildare-street Society, he differed from the hon Baronet. He denied that the Society was popular in Ireland; on the contrary, it was one of the most unpopular that ever existed. It was not unpopular in the county which the hon. Member represented, but the inhabitants of that county entertained different opinions on most subjects from the inhabitants of other parts of Ireland. The Gentleman who last represented them lost his seat because he dared to vote in favour of Catholic Emancipation. He had no doubt that the Society was very well received by them. The hon. Baronet probably subscribed to it because he wished to encourage education. The Society professed a great deal, and unfortunately had not convinced him of the truth of its professions. Its acts, however, were contrary to its professions; and he had left it in consequence. But, he did not retire alone; on the very day on which he resigned, the noble President, the Duke of Leinster, Lord Cloncurry, and many other gentlemen resigned, and for the same reason. The Catholic clergy of Ireland condemned the Society. He did not mean to argue theological points, but the hon. Member had thought fit to introduce one, and he would not shrink, either in that House or in any other place, from defending the doctrines of the religion he professed. He objected to allowing the word of God to be placed in the hands of Catholic children without note or comment; he did not object to its being so placed in the hands of Protestants; they had a right to use it in any shape they thought fit, and he should be the last man to interfere with the exercise of any such right. He objected, however, to any Protestant having it in his power to go to the children of Catholic parents, and impose on them a mode of instruction of which the parents did not approve. The Catholic clergy inculcated the principles by which the people wished to abide—the Protestants might have schools, as many as they pleased; all that the Catholics wanted was, that their children should be educated in the manner their parents thought proper. The hon. member for Londonderry seemed not to be aware of the fact, that a Select Committee of the House, which rigidly inquired into this very subject, ultimately agreed with the Catholics, and called on the House to make no further grants to the Kildare-street Society. The hon. Baronet seemed to think it a great blessing that Roman Catholic children should receive an education of which their parents did not approve, while the Protestant children should be educated in a manner of which their parents did approve; and both were to be educated together. Now, the Catholic clergy proposed, that they should be educated together, but that one day in the week should be set apart for religious education, on which the children of Catholics and Protestants should be instructed separately. He would put it to any man whether the Catholics had not a right to educate their children in such religious tenets as they pleased? He would appeal to the hon. member for Londonderry himself, whether they had not an equal right with the Protestants so to do? He was ready to admit that the Presbyterians wished their children to be educated in the manner practised by the Society. Well, let the Presbyterians be educated as they chose, the Catholics as they chose—that was all the latter required. The hon. Member had charged him with a species of inconsistency, and if he ever wished to interfere with the religious principles of any human being, he would allow that hon. Member to charge him with anything. He had never so interfered, or uttered a sentiment that tended to interference. He entertained a firm conviction that religion was an affair between man and his God; and he who interfered on the subject might call himself a Christian, but other men would call him a blasphemer. He could bear, with the utmost complacency, the boasts of the Presbyterians, knowing that the world was greatly indebted to them for the liberties it possessed, and feeling, as he did, a high degree of respect for the independent members of that body. But let them be content to do by the Catholics as the Catholics would do by them — leave the latter to educate their children as they pleased.

Mr. *Lefroy* did not intend to delay the House by offering many observations on the subject. No man could regret more than he did, that the time of the House should be occupied by discussions of that nature. The hon. Baronet, however, was fully justified in making his observations relative to the Kildare-place Society, and he should himself be unworthy of his seat in that House if he did not declare that it was a most useful institution. He differed from the opinion of the hon. member for Waterford as to the popularity of the Society; and if the Government wished to preserve the Union, and the security of the two parts of the empire, it would encourage a system which gave education to 120,000 children, Catholics and Protestants.

Sir *J. Newport* observed, that the Society was one which derived its support from grants of the public money, and that being the case, the proper time for discussing its merits would be when those grants should be next proposed. There could be no objection to the proceedings of the Society, so long as it was willing to afford education in such a manner as persons of different religious persuasions could approve of: the complaint against the Society was, that its principle necessarily excluded a considerable number of the people of Ireland from the benefits of that education, which the national grants were destined to promote.

Petition to lie on the Table.

SUPPLY—BANK OF ENGLAND.] Lord Althorp moved the Order of the Day for the House resolving itself into a Committee of the whole House, to consider further of the Supply to be granted to his Majesty.

Sir *H. Parnell* wished to ask a question of the noble Lord before the House went into a committee. The Charter of the Bank of England would, the House was aware, expire in 1833, and he was desirous of receiving some information on the subject of its renewal. In the course of the last Session, an hon. Member of that House, the late Mr. Huskisson, gave notice of a motion, by which he proposed to draw the attention of the House to this important subject, but he was prevented from doing so by the temporary absence of the Secretary of State for the Home Department. This subject must now press with greater force on their attention, as the termination of the Charter was so nearly approaching. He did not now rise with a view to enter into an examination of the policy pursued by former Administrations with respect to this question. Their custom was, to make an arrangement, in the first instance, with the Bank of England, and then to come to Parliament for its sanction; thereby leaving the House hardly an opportunity to examine such arrangement. Now, he earnestly hoped to hear from the Chancellor of the Exchequer that this course would not be pursued on the present occasion, but that the House of Commons would be called on to institute a strict examination into all the circumstances connected with the banking-system of England, before they granted a renewal of the Charter, in order, on the one hand, that they might prevent the recurrence of those convulsions and those enormous losses which had been sustained by the present banking system, and on the other, to give to the country the great and immense benefit which would be derived from a sound system of banking. The subject was of the utmost importance, and he took the opportunity which now presented itself of procuring for himself and for the public some precise information relative to it. He hoped, therefore, that the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, would state to the House what course was intended to be followed on this occasion.

Lord *Althorp* said, he thought it would probably be found proper and fitting for the House to enter into an inquiry on this subject in the present Session. He had not positively made up his mind whether that inquiry should be instituted during this Session or in the next; but his impression was, that it would be desirable if it took place in the present. As to his right hon. friend's observation upon the course which former Governments had pursued with respect to the Bank, he pledged himself to his right hon. friend, and to the House, that no such system should be now adopted. The question should be submitted to the House perfectly free from any private arrangement between the Government and the Bank. At the same time, Ministers would make up their minds as to what appeared to them right and proper to be done, but no pledge would be given, no engagement would be entered into. No man could attach more importance to the question than he did. He felt that it was most essential to place the whole banking system of the country on a sound footing, in order to secure the interests of the public.

EAST-INDIA COMPANY'S CHARTER.] General *Gascoyne* wished to know at what time it was intended to renew the committee which was appointed last Session to inquire into the state of the trade with India and China?

Lord *Althorp* said, it was not his intention to move for the renewal of that committee before the recess. The reason was, that the President of the Board of Control would not take his seat in that House until after Christmas, and it was necessary that he should be present when the committee was renewed.

REDUCTION OF SALARIES' COMMITTEE.] Mr. *Phillpotts* said, he wished to make a few observations with reference to the select committee that was appointed last night. He observed that the noble Lord himself was on that committee, although he had understood that no person connected with the Administration was to be placed on it. Two members of the late Government were also appointed members of the committee. These Gentlemen were certainly placed in a very extraordinary situation; because, if they declared that the salaries were too large, they would thereby convict themselves of having, during the many years they held office, received enormous salaries—salaries greatly disproportioned to the duties performed by them. They would, therefore, be in some measure compelled to state that the salaries were not too great. He also observed that the names of several of those who last night expressed strongly their opinion that the salaries were not too large, were introduced on this committee; but not one of those individuals who entertained a very different opinion had been placed on it. He had one other observation to make on this subject. He saw, on the Order-book, a notice given by an hon. Alderman (Wood) for a specific motion for the reduction of those salaries, which he proposed to bring on after the recess. How was it, he asked, that that hon. Alderman was not on this committee? As he meant to make a specific motion, he must have directed his attention to the subject, and therefore he was a proper person to be placed on the committee. He now asked the noble Lord, with the most perfect cordiality whether he had any objection to make this addition to the committee?

Lord *Althorp* said, he was quite ready to give the hon. Member an answer. His object was to place no person on the Committee who could be supposed to be under the influence of Government. With respect to the placing two of the late Ministers on the Committee, that was done for the purpose of arriving at details of official business, which could not be given by any other persons. And though he had been all his life politically opposed to them as Ministers, still there were no individuals on whose honour, fairness, and integrity, he would place greater reliance. If their salaries had been too high, the blame rested with the House, and not with them; and, therefore, it was proper that the whole subject should be investigated by a Committee, whose labours would be laid before the House, which could then decide on its recommendation. The hon. Member said, he was surprised that no person who spoke in favour of a reduction of salaries was placed on the Committee. It was strange, that he overlooked the hon. member for Dorsetshire, who had been all his life anxious for a reduction of expenditure. The hon. Member also observed, that some Gentlemen who spoke last night unfavourably of a reduction of salaries, were named on the Committee. But, he could say, that he selected the Committee with the greatest care before the debate, and therefore what then passed could not have affected the nomination. With respect to the hon. Alderman, he had no objection to his being added to the Committee. He had quite forgotten that the hon. Alderman had given the notice alluded to. His great object was to frame the Committee so as to give perfect satisfaction to the country; and it would have been most absurd if Ministers intended any thing else.

Sir *G. Warrender* expressed his regret at not having seen the hon. member for Dorsetshire on the Committee that morning. Had he been present, he doubted not that he would have been appointed Chairman, —a situation for which his extensive experience peculiarly qualified him.

Sir *R. Peel* admitted, that the Committee was very fairly formed. If individuals were not included who last night spoke in favour of reduction, it could only have been the result of chance, arising out of the manner in which the appointment of Committees was ordinarily arranged. The subject to be considered was an exceedingly delicate one. It would be very difficult to say what would be a sufficient remuneration for a Prime Minister, or a leader in the House of Commons, without inquiring into the private circumstances of the individual. With reference to the circumstances in which he was placed, he could not help thinking that the object of this inquiry would be much better served by omitting him (Sir R. Peel) and his right hon. friend. They were placed in a more painful situation than if they even were subject to the influence of the Government; because any honourable man in office would much rather agree to a reduction of his salary, than say that for many years he had been receiving more than the public ought to have paid. In his opinion, therefore, it would be more likely to afford satisfaction to the public, if those who had held office were merely called on to give their evidence. It would be much more agreeable to him to appear before the Committee as a witness, than to sit on it as a Judge; for if he gave his conscientious opinion that the salaries ought not to be lowered, it might be unjustly supposed that he was only vindicating the character and conduct of himself and of those who had been connected with him in office. If it were necessary that he should act on the Committee, he would not shrink from the performance of his duty; but he thought it would be better to omit his name and that of his right hon. friend. He begged leave again to state his willingness to give all the information in his power, to facilitate the inquiry; and to say, at the same time, that he thought the Committee was very fairly framed.

An *hon. Member* concurred in the opinion of the right hon. Baronet, that it would have been better if his name and that of his right hon. friend had been omitted in forming the Committee. At the same time he gave to the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, full credit for the fairness with which the Committee was selected.

THE JEWS.] Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. R. Grant) whether he was prepared on an early day to bring forward a measure similar to that which he introduced last Session, for the relief of persons professing the Jewish religion?

Mr. *R. Grant* said, he had intimated on a former occasion that it was not his intention to drop this subject, and he would now state, for the information of the hon. and learned Gentleman, that on an early day, on Monday next, he would present a petition from individuals of the Jewish persuasion, and he would then state when he meant to bring the question forward which he was, at some period of the Session, fully pledged to do.

PROCESSION OF THE TRADES TO ST. JAMES'S PALACE.] Mr. *Grove Price* said, that seeing the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his place, he was anxious to take the opportunity of putting a question to him on a subject of great constitutional importance. He could assure the noble Lord that his question did not arise from any spirit of hostility to him, or from any desire to embarrass the new Government. He would put the same question to the members of the late Government under similar circumstances. Neither was he disposed to put his question in the absence of his hon. and learned friend, the chief legal adviser of the Crown in that House, for whom, on public and private grounds, he had a great esteem; and for whose consistency of public principle he had the highest respect,—a consistency which, he regretted to say, he had not seen in some others who held that situation before him; but he thought the subject was one so interesting in a constitutional point of view, that it ought not to be postponed. His question was, whether the Government of which the noble Lord formed a part, were aware of the intention of the large masses of the people who had accompanied the deputation to present the Address a few days ago to his Majesty, at his Palace of St. James's, to form the procession which had gone up? He wished to know whether this assemblage had the deliberate sanction of his Majesty's Ministers, or had been allowed to proceed with their tacit acquiescence. He was desirous to have an answer to this, because it was important to know whether the Government had sanctioned, or only connived at, that which he must say was clearly a violation of the Statute-law of the land. He was aware that it was held in a very high legal quarter that the assemblage to which he alluded was not illegal—and that it was even a highly constitutional assemblage. With every respect for the great legal authority to which he referred, he knew that the opinion of others, for whose great legal knowledge and acquirements those who were acquainted with them had the greatest respect, was very different. He would say, that some of the highest legal authorities in the country took a very different view of this matter as to the point of law. On this account he regretted that this subject had not been introduced by some Member of great eminence, skill, and legal knowledge, and possessing in consequence more weight with the House than he could pretend to. Humble as he was, he had no hesitation in saying that the procession to St. James's Palace, carrying up an Address to the Sovereign, was illegal. The Statute of which it was a violation, was the 13th of Charles 2nd. The necessity for the passing of such an Act at that time was obvious. The country was then smarting under the effects produced by tumultuous assemblages of persons met for the purposes of petitioning. It might be said, that the procession to which he referred had not been a tumultuous assemblage, but, according to the Statute he had quoted, and the clause of which he would read, it was not necessary that a tumult should take place to render the meeting illegal.

An *hon. Member* here rose to order,—If the hon. Gentleman wished to ask a very plain question, as it appeared to be, he put it to him whether it would not be the better course to ask it at once, without occupying the time of the House at such length.

The *Speaker* said, that the hon. Member who rose to order, was himself not quite in order.

Mr. *Grove Price* said, he was anxious to explain the grounds on which he put the question. The clause of the Act of the 13th Charles 2nd, to which he begged to call the attention of the House, was to this effect—that no person or persons whatsoever shall repair to his Majesty, or to both or either Houses of Parliament, on the pretence or for the purpose of presenting any Petition, Declaration, or Address, accompanied by any excessive—not tumultuous—but any excessive numbers; and that the number of persons accompanying the carrying up of any such Petition or Address shall not exceed ten, on pain of fine and imprisonment. The House were aware of the danger against which this Act was intended to guard; and most certainly, under that Act, the procession in question was illegal. It was no matter whether the meeting was tumultuous or not. He argued the question on principle; for if there were no tumult or inconvenience,—and he thought there were both, and that many peaceable and well-disposed persons were considerably alarmed and inconvenienced by such an assembly,—but supposing there were neither, he must still say that it made no difference in the principle for which he contended. There might be no tumult at one such assemblage, or at another, but the admission of the precedent would tend gradually to lead from shade to shade of disturbance, till at last the most serious evils might not only be apprehended, but be really produced by it. This was no new doctrine of his. It was the opinion pronounced by some of the highest legal authorities of which this country could boast. At the time of Lord George Gordon's mob, this Act of Charles 2nd was quoted by Lord Mansfield, who stated that under that Act any large assembly of persons, however peaceable in their demeanour, attending to present a Petition to the Sovereign, or to either House of Parliament, was illegal. This doctrine was acquiesced in by Judges Buller and Ashurst, and it was also clearly laid down by Mr. Justice Blackstone. It was also the doctrine of a writer who was not remarkable for his great attachment to royalty or the high prerogative of Kings. The meeting to which he referred was an assemblage of many thousands of persons, who went up for the purpose of paying a compliment to their Sovereign: but in the procession was introduced that banner, which had been the signal of more crime, bloodshed, rapine, and destruction than any other that had ever been raised in Europe [*Cheers and laughter.*] He cared not for the cheers of hon. Gentlemen. He appealed to history, which was of much greater authority than their cheers, when he asserted that more scenes of horror, and cruelty, and destruction, had been committed under that banner, than any other that had been raised in Europe. He reported his hope that no defence would be set up for this assemblage on the ground that it had not been productive of any riot or tumult: that made no difference as to its legality. His objection was to the principle; and because he so objected, he wished to know from the noble Lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) how far the assemblage had received the direct sanction or the connivance of Ministers.

Lord *Althorp* begged leave in answer to the question of the hon. and learned Member, to state the circumstances of the case as they had come to the knowledge of Government. Very soon after his noble friend, the Secretary of State for the Home Department came into office, he was waited upon by a deputation from the trades' societies, who expressed the great disappointment that had been experienced by the bodies to which they belonged, at not having had an opportunity, after the preparations they had made, of testifying their loyal and dutiful attachment to his Majesty, as they expected to have done had he visited the City; and they added a wish that they might be permitted to present the Address they had prepared at one of the levees. To this his noble friend replied, that there could be no objection, but his noble friend did not understand that it was intended that the deputation should be accompanied by any procession such as that which had taken place, and it was only a day or two before the intended presentation that he learned that it was to be accompanied by the procession of the trades. As soon as that information reached him, he lost no time in consulting with the Magistrates of police and others whose duty it was to attend to the preservation of the peace of the metropolis. From these gentlemen he learned, that the peace of the City would run less risk of being interrupted by allowing the procession to proceed peaceably, than by prohibiting its assemblage, and they added that if no order to disturb it were issued, they would be answerable for the preservation of the peace, for which they had made sufficient arrangements. The result was as had been predicted. The meeting was most peaceable in its conduct from first to last. Under these circumstances, he must say, that he considered his noble friend acted with great prudence and sound sense in allowing the procession to proceed without interruption. He would at the same time admit that, according to the strict letter of the Act which the hon. and learned Gentleman had quoted, an offence had been committed in the assemblage of such a mass of persons to present an Address to the Sovereign, yet it would be unwise in Government to institute any prosecution for that offence. Such a course would be the most ill-advised and imprudent which any Government could adopt. When the people conducted themselves too with so much good order, it would have been most ill-judged to disturb them then, or to prosecute them afterwards for having assembled, even though such an assembly was, strictly speaking, illegal. At the same time he would admit the very great inconvenience of such assemblies on similar occasions, or of making this case a precedent for future processions for similar objects. It was well known that this Act had often been violated by processions with Addresses, without having any notice taken of their illegality; witness the presentation of addresses from the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. [Mr. *G. Price:* 'These are permitted by Act of Parliament.'] Admitting that to be the case, he would still say in the general proposition of the hon. and learned Member he concurred, and that, according to the strict interpretation of the Act, such assemblies were illegal, though they had not unfrequently been permitted, and under the particular circumstances of the case, it would have been highly imprudent to disturb this one. The hon. and learned Gentleman had alluded to the fact of this assemblage having had amongst their banners a tri-colour flag. He would admit with him that that flag had been the signal of much crime and of much bloodshed, but these characters did not belong to the tri-coloured flag of the present day; and if the assemblage of Wednesday had borne that flag, of which he had not heard until now, no doubt it was not out of any approval of the scenes which had formerly taken place under it, but from admiration of the great and glorious and successful struggle for liberty which had been made under it in France during the last days of July. That was a feeling in which he, in common with the great mass of the people of this country, most cordially joined, and he owned that, with the admissions he had already made as to this meeting, he could not think its character worse, by bearing such a flag as an expression of their admiration of that glorious event.

Mr. *Long Wellesley* said, that the spirit of the Act which the hon. and learned Gentleman had referred to was not violated by the meeting; but that though its letter might not have been in strictness adhered to, his Majesty's Government had acted with great wisdom and prudence in allowing the procession to approach his Majesty without interruption in the way it had done; and he must own, that he was rather surprised at the hon. and learned Member quoting an Act, passed at such a period as the time of Charles 2nd, and now almost forgotten, with a view of applying its provisions to times like the present. If he recollected correctly, this Act was passed in the second year of the actual reign of Charles 2nd; and when hon. Members looked back to the spirit of those times, they would find that certain Acts of the same spirit were passed to render the proceedings of the Long Parliament more palatable to the Crown. But though the Act was, in strictness, still the law of the land, yet it was a law which, in the present very different tone and temper of the country, it would be neither wise nor prudent to enforce according to its strict letter. He thought, therefore, Ministers acted the part of sensible and prudent men in not restricting those ebullitions of loyalty on the part of the people, for which they had made such preparations, and which there was no reason to doubt would be expressed in any other than a peaceful and decorous manner. If Ministers had permitted his Majesty's residence to be approached by a tumultuous assembly, they would, no doubt, be held justly responsible to the country; but after what he had that evening heard of the character of the assembly, and after what he had heard in another place on the subject, he must say, that Ministers had acted with wisdom and sound discretion; and their conduct must raise them in the estimation of the country,—in the confidence of which he was happy to know they were gaining ground more and more every day. Before he sat down he would beg to say a word or two as to what fell from the hon.

and learned Member who had introduced this subject. The hon. and learned Member, with a want of that quickness of perception which he understood distinguished him elsewhere, had confounded two very important periods in the history of France, and had taken the tri-coloured flag of the present day, as a signal for the horrors which had occurred under it during the first Revolution. No two periods could be more different in the character of the events which distinguished them. For his part he execrated the horrors of the first Revolution as much as any man, but it would be a most unfounded attack on the conduct of those brave men who had immortalized themselves in the late Revolution, to look upon their national flag now as a signal for rapine, bloodshed, and destruction. From what he had recently seen in France, and from what he knew of many of those who were most conspicuous in the delivery of their country, he would say, that the crimes of the first Revolution had been in a great measure expiated by the glorious manner in which the second had been achieved. Let it be also considered, that if the flag of France was borne in a procession here, it was the flag of a nation whose Sovereign we had recognized, and whom, he trusted, we should long continue to call the firm ally of the king of England.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, there could be no doubt that a meeting, such as that assembled the other day for the purpose of going up with an Address to the Sovereign, was illegal. Such a meeting might be, as that was, quite peaceable, but still, an actual tumult was not necessary in order to render it illegal. The mobs which assembled under Lord George Gordon, professed that they met for the most peaceable purposes, but, nevertheless, all the authorities of that day, and ever since, had no doubt that they were illegal assemblies. Indeed, it was impossible to consider that an assemblage of 10,000 or 20,000 persons round the doors of Parliament, in times of public calamity, or in a period of great excitement, should not have some undue control on their proceedings, and on this ground such assemblages, however peaceable their professed and even real object might be, were very wisely prohibited. With respect to the case before the House, he was very glad to find that Government looked upon it rather as an exception to the general rule than the rule; for undoubtedly, if such assemblages were to be permitted on the precedent of this, it might lead to serious evils, and certainly would cause very great public inconvenience. He owned he had heard now for the first time, but with great regret, that a tri-coloured flag had been borne amongst the banners of that procession. He heard it with the more regret, as, from the communication that had been made to him by the deputation that had waited upon him before he went out of office, he had understood that nothing of this kind was contemplated. Three persons from the trades' societies had waited upon him, acquainting him with the circumstances to which the noble Lord (Althorp) had already alluded in his statement of what occurred before the noble Lord now at the head of the Home Department. Those three individuals were not of any high rank in life, but he had received and treated them with a respect which he considered very justly due to the good sense and intelligence which they appeared to possess. They stated the disappointment experienced by the trades at the postponement of his Majesty's intended visit to the City, after the expensive preparations they had made in flags and banners to receive him, and they expressed a wish to be allowed to present their Addresses at the levee. He said, there could be no objection to that course, but it must be with the clear understanding that not many of their body should come up with the deputation. On that understanding they went away; and he had no doubt that a similar understanding was entered into with the noble Lord, his successor in office. As to the tri-coloured flag, he would admit that, as the flag of a country whose change of government we had acknowledged, and with which we were in perfect amity, it could not be considered as the representative of any crimes which in former times had been committed under it; but, at the same time, he should wish, that in a procession got up to compliment the Sovereign of this country, there should be no other flag introduced but our own national flags. He would have said the same last year, had the white flag been borne in any similar procession. Still he must hope that there was some mistake in this, and that a flag belonging to one of the trades which were of various colours was mistaken for the tri-colour, for he owned he could not have expected, after what had passed between him and the leaders of this procession, that they would have sanctioned any thing of this kind.

Mr. *Cornewall* said, that he was in Pall Mall on the day in question, and saw the whole procession pass. He could not tell why, but there had been an impression on his mind, while the procession was passing, that he should see the tri-coloured flag among the banners; but it was not there; he could take upon himself to say, that there was no tri-coloured flag, and he should be ready even to depose to that fact in a Court of Justice.

Sir *Robert Peel* was now more convinced that there must have been some mistake as to the flag being a tri-colour; but even if it were, it would be unfair to fix upon it as the act of those who managed the procession. In an assembly of 10,000 persons, it was impossible to guard against the introduction of such a flag, by one or two; and it would therefore be unjust to charge it as the act of the whole.

Lord *John Russell* said, since the right hon. Baronet viewed the question without any disposition to impute blame to his noble friend at the head of the Home Department, he was ready to admit with him, that, according to the strict letter of the Act, the procession was not legal, and that it ought not to be drawn into a precedent for any future procession on similar occasions, for he acknowledged that such a practice might give rise to serious evils. From the letter and spirit of the Statute, it was clearly illegal that large masses of the people should go up with Addresses, yet it was but justice to the individuals who were assembled on that occasion to say, that not only was their conduct harmless and inoffensive, but praiseworthy, for the perfect good order and decorum which they had observed throughout. Let it also be recollected, that this body did not go up to petition—to ask any thing of the Sovereign—but simply to present an Address expressive of their loyalty and dutiful attachment to his Majesty. As to whether they bore the tri-coloured flag or not, he could not say; but if they had, he could not look upon it as intended as any insult to our own national flag, to which the people of this country were greatly attached, as they were also to the person of the gracious Sovereign under whom they had the happiness to live. The flag, if introduced at all, must have been intended as a complimentary mode of expressing their admiration of the glorious struggle which had so recently been made for liberty under that banner.

Sir *Robert Peel* wished to be understood as not giving any opinion as to the policy of permitting this procession; but he would fully admit that, under the circumstances in which the knowledge of it had reached the noble Lord, the Secretary for the Home Department, it would have been impolitic to proscribe the meeting. He had been long enough in office himself to know the cases of difficulty which often presented themselves to the Home Secretary, and he fully admitted the difficulty in which the noble Lord was placed when he heard of the intended procession at so very short a period before the day that it was to take place. No doubt, if sufficient notice had been given, the noble Lord would, as he ought, have prevented it; but with so little notice, and the preparations that had been made, it was, he admitted, acting with prudence to let it proceed undisturbed.

Mr. *G. Lamb* said, that it was only the day before the intended procession that the Home Secretary was made acquainted with it, and that by having a placard brought to the office, noticing the intention of the trades to go up to the Palace. Under these circumstances, he thought it would have been the height of imprudence, not to say downright madness, to have prevented the procession, as it could not have been done without resorting to force. He would only add, with reference to what fell from the hon. and learned Gentleman, as to the conduct of the people, that their peaceable demeanour, after they had come up in the expectation of obtaining a sight of their Sovereign, and of receiving an answer to their Address, was entitled to great praise, and in the present period of excitement it more fully proved the loyalty and attachment to their Sovereign of the people of the metropolis. On the subject of the right of petitioning, he might be allowed to say a word. It was a right in which the strict letter of the law was every day violated without a word being said about it. For instance, petitions were presented to and received by that House, praying for reform and other changes, and yet by law no petition could be presented for any alteration in Church and State signed by more than twenty persons, unless it was signed by the Lord Mayor, or by the Magistrates in Quarter Sessions, or by some other potentates of that description.

The House then resolved itself into a Committee of Supply.

Lord *Althorp* said, he should at present merely move "That it is the opinion of this committee, that a sum not exceeding 100,000*l.* be granted to his Majesty towards satisfying the Annuities and Pensions payable out of the Consolidated Fund or Civil List, deficient from the demise of the late King up to the 5th of January, 1831." As the House would have ample opportunity for investigating the subject immediately after the recess, he did not anticipate that any objection would be made to the present Motion, and should therefore sit down without offering any further observations.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, it was not his intention to oppose the proposition of the noble Lord, for although it was a departure from former precedents, existing circumstances sufficiently accounted for the deviation. On all other occasions it had been the first act of the Legislature, on the demise of the Crown, to make provision for the Civil List. He was not surprised at the proposed deviation from established custom, but could not help regretting it, as the precedent might possibly prove inconvenient hereafter. It appeared to be most for the interest of all parties, that the question should be brought to a conclusion as soon as circumstances would admit. Under this feeling, he repeated, he did not mean to give any opposition to the motion just made by the noble Lord.

Lord *Althorp* concurred with the right hon. Gentleman in thinking that it would have been more desirable to make an arrangement for the provision of the Civil List at the commencement of the Session, but the late changes having been effected so recently, it was out of the power of his Majesty's present Ministers to make themselves masters of the details in a manner which would enable them so soon to propose the Civil List on their own responsibility. Had they attempted to do so, they would not have acted consistently with their duty to the public. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to apprehend danger from the precedent, but all precedents were to be considered in connexion with the circumstances which induced them, and he had no hesitation in saying that the future recurrence of similar circumstances would warrant the adoption of a similar line of conduct.

Vote agreed to.

A Resolution, "That it is the opinion of this Committee, that a sum, not exceeding 750,000*l.*, be granted to his Majesty, towards defraying the interest on Exchequer-bills," was also adopted *nem. con.*

The House resumed, the report to be received on Monday.

REGENCY BILL.] The House then resolved itself into a Committee on the Regency Bill. On reading the first clause,

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* objected to the wording of it, as excluding from the Throne all possible issue of the King, by any marriage after the death of the present Queen, in favour of the Princess Victoria. It was possible that her present Majesty might die, that the King might marry again, and have issue, and from the manner in which this clause was worded, bestowing the Regency on the Duchess of Kent, in case his Majesty should die without issue by his present Consort, it would postpone the claims of that issue to the right of the Princess Victoria. The hon. and learned Gentleman moved, as an Amendment, to substitute for the words "Leaving no issue by her present Majesty," the words, "Leaving no issue him surviving."

Sir *Robert Peel* thought there was no necessity for the Amendment. The Bill was intended only to apply to existing circumstances. Certainly it was possible that her Majesty might die, but before the King could complete another marriage he must come to Parliament. That would be time enough to provide for the case the hon. and learned Gentleman supposed. The present Bill was only to remove doubts as to who should exercise the Royal authority in one particular case, and therefore the Amendment was not necessary.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* admitted, that the Act was intended to provide for a particular case, but as the first clause was of a general description, the Amendment that he proposed seemed necessary.

The *Attorney General* (Sir Thomas Denman) admitted the force of the hon. and learned Gentleman's observation. The Bill as it now stood implied a restriction which he understood was not intended. The best way of amending it, however, would be, to leave out the words "her present Majesty," making the enactment depend on his Majesty dying without issue.

Mr. *O'Connell* took the same objection to the clause as the hon. and learned member for Kircudbright (Mr. Cutlar Ferguson), but he thought the best way of amending it was that proposed by the Attorney General.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* agreed to the suggestion of the Attorney General.

Sir *Robert Peel* cautioned the House how they admitted the proposed alteration, for it would alter the whole principle of the Bill. The very intention of the Bill was to provide for the contingency of her present Majesty having no issue, and that alone. He would remind the House, that it would be very unadvisable to make any general measure without much consideration, for it was possible that marriages might be contracted which would be good in law, though not held valid by Parliament. If they meant to constitute a Regency for all possible cases, a different bill would be required.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* thought the other clauses might, without difficulty, be adapted to the proposed Amendment.

Lord *Althorp* saw the difficulty which had been pointed out, but in general he agreed with the view taken of the Bill, and of the care required to alter it, by the right hon. Baronet. If it were necessary to alter the Bill, he should prefer the Amendment suggested by his hon. and learned friend, the Attorney General; but, at the same time, as the Bill was of so much importance, he hoped his hon. and learned friend would not press his Amendment till the Report was brought up.

Mr. *Tennyson* observed, that it was a most grave and serious matter, for the Bill might be a Bill of Exclusion, and might regulate the succession. The Bill, however, contemplated only one contingency, and to that it ought to be confined.

Mr. *O'Connell* also again contended, that the Bill, as it was worded, might be a Bill of Exclusion.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* thought the perfection of the Bill was, that it was strictly limited to the particular case; and should the case supposed by the hon. and learned Gentleman arrive, the King would have to come to Parliament to complete his marriage, and then the circumstance might be provided for.

The *Attorney General* defended his proposed Amendment, and showed that all the other clauses of the Bill might be easily adapted to it. Of course, however, he should defer to the wishes of his noble friend, and postpone his Amendment till the bringing up of the Report.

Sir *Robert Peel* entered his protest against introducing words into the Bill which would imply that any Queen Consort might be Regent.

After some further conversation, the consideration of the Amendment was postponed. Several of the following clauses were agreed to without amendment.

On the suggestion of Mr. O'Connell, the words "Roman Catholic" were substituted for the word "Papist" in the clause where it was necessarily introduced. The other clauses were agreed to without amendments. The Report was ordered to be received on Monday next.

[Mr. Phillpotts withdrew his motion for an Address for a copy of all communications which had taken place between the Lord Bishop of Exeter and his Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, respecting the said Bishop's holding the Rectory of Stanhope *in commendam* with the See of Exeter.]

CHURCH OF ENGLAND RESIDENTS AND NON-RESIDENTS.] Mr. *Long Wellesley* said, that in rising to move for the returns which he should read at the conclusion of his observations, he was actuated by no feelings of hostility towards the Church, but by a sincere desire to render it as pure and useful as its best friends could wish. His object in moving for them was twofold. He wished in the first place to ascertain the number of clergymen who did not reside on their benefices, in order to devise some general measure to compel their residence—a consummation which was highly desirable, as he could state from his own personal experience that in all parishes where the clergymen were resident, the condition of the poor was much better than in those parishes where the clergymen were not resident. He wished in the next place, if the information obtained by these returns should warrant it, to found upon it a measure for the better payment of the working clergy, similar to that which a noble Lord had carried through the other House of Parliament, with equal credit to his head and his heart. The hon. Member then moved, for "a return of the annual separate estimated value of every Vicarage, Rectory, Living, or other clerical benefice in the gift of the Crown, with the name and description of each benefice, and its value in the King's books, as contrasted with its actual value; a return, with the name and description of every Living on which there is no clerical residence whatever;—a return of those Livings upon which there is a suitable clerical residence, and whether such residence is or is not in repair, and to what purpose converted;—a return of the number of the parochial benefices in the gift of the Crown, the duties of which are performed by those to whom the benefices have been given, or by Curates, and whether those Curates be resident upon such benefice, and if non-resident, where residing;—a return of the income which each Curate derives *bona fide* from his Patron, Vicar, or other superior, for the annual performance of his professional duties."

Mr. *Leader* suggested that these returns ought also to be made regarding the value of every benefice in Ireland.

Mr. *Long Wellesley* could not agree to the suggestion, because he believed that a commission was now inquiring into the value and amount of Church property in Ireland.

Mr. *Fyler* hoped, that the returns would be demanded, not merely from the incumbents of all benefices in the gift of the Crown, but also from the incumbents of all churches throughout England.

Mr. *Long Wellesley* could not agree to this suggestion, any more than he could to that which had been already made to him. He would candidly admit, that his reason for moving for these returns was his belief that there was ground of complaint as to the non-residence of the secular clergy. He had limited his inquiry to the Livings in the gift of the Crown, because he did not wish to give offence to the hierarchy, and because he had observed that inquiries which were very large in their nature, were not in general productive of any beneficial result. His object was, to collect a mass of information so condensed and specific in its nature that a practical measure could easily be founded upon it.

Returns ordered.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Saturday, Dec. 11.

MINUTES.] Returns ordered. On the Motion of Lord ALTHORP, an Address, for accounts of the Population of each City and Borough in England now returning Members to Parliament, to be prepared from the Parliamentary census of 1821; of the Population of each City and Town in England not now returning Members to Parliament, which amounted in 1821 to 10,000 or upwards; of the Population of each County in England and Scotland, to be prepared from the Parliamentary census; a similar Return of the Population of each Royal Borough in Scotland, now sharing in the return of a Member to Parliament, and of each City not so sharing, the population of which in 1821 exceeded 8,000.

Petitions presented. For the speedy abolition of Negro Slavery, by Mr. LLOYD, four from Methodist Congregations at Romsey, Winchester, and Southampton:—By Sir R. FERGUSSON, two from parishes in Fife:—By Mr. RUMBOLD, from Yarmouth:—By Lord STANLEY, five from parishes in Cheshire, and from Wigan and Liverpool:—By Mr. DENISON, two from Dissenting Chapels at Clapham and Walworth:—By Mr. B. SMITH, from Tralee:—By Mr. BIDDULPH, from Tenby and Colton:—By Mr. S. RICE, from Kingston-upon-Thames. By Lord STANLEY, from the Shopkeepers of Great and Little Bolton, against the Truck System. By Mr. PHILLIPS, from Glastonbury, for the repeal of the Assessed Taxes. By Mr. JAMES JOHNSTONE, from Stirling and Dunfermling, for Parliamentary Reform.

A Committee reported, that Mr. STUART WORTLEY was not duly elected to serve in Parliament for Forfar district of Burghs, and a new Writ was, on the Motion of the Chairman, ordered to be issued.

REPEAL OF THE UNION.] Mr. *Spring Rice* presented two petitions from the city and county of Limerick, praying for a Repeal of the Union. The hon. Member said, that he was sorry he could not, consistently with his sense of public duty and personal integrity, give any support to the prayer of the petitioners. He was well convinced that a repeal of the Union would not benefit the people of Ireland, but that it would materially injure that country, and inflict the greatest evils upon the empire at large. As he gave the petitioners credit for honourable motives in forming the views they entertained upon the subject, it was but reasonable that they should extend the same liberality towards him, and that they should concede to him what he willingly yielded to them—the right of forming private opinions upon the subject.

Mr. *O'Connell*, at the request of the petitioners, supported the petition. He had been accused of being the instigator of the petitions upon this subject, but he denied the charge, and appealed to the hon. member for Limerick for its fallacy. The petitions were, in fact, produced by great distress, which made men cast about for relief. He had announced last year that the distress was great, and it continued. It was impossible, indeed, to give an adequate idea of the distress and misery of Ireland. In Limerick it was frightful. He regretted, that the hon. member for Limerick disagreed with the petition; for he thought a repeal of the Union was the only measure that could possibly relieve the distress. Hon. Members could know nothing of the extent of this distress, as the London Press carefully avoided mentioning it. In fact, he wished for a Parliament in Ireland, because the Press of England, being governed by self-interest, had no motive to attend to the affairs of that country; and the condition, opinions, and sentiments, of the Irish people were, therefore, little known on this side of the Channel. Were the Union repealed, Irish opinion would find its weight. He feared that the opinion delivered by the hon. member for Limerick would be the means of depriving the House of the talents of that hon. Member.

Mr. *Maberly* was convinced, that if agitation were not artfully kept up by designing persons, Ireland would be tranquil, and would excite a confidence that would occasion a flow of capital into that country. He had the means of knowing that the petitions asking for the repeal of the Union did not express the sentiments of the people. He thought the hon. and learned Member for Waterford might do something to remove the agitation which now prevailed, if he were so disposed.

Colonel *O'Grady* could say nothing of the petitions, but he knew them to be signed by most respectable people.

Mr. *Briscoe* thought, that the hon. member for Waterford ought to give Government fair play in its efforts to meliorate the condition of Ireland, and not throw difficulties in its way, by agitating that country. The only argument, indeed, which the learned Gentleman used in that House for the repeal of the Union was the neglect of Ireland by the King's Government. The charge always made by Irish Members was, that Government neglected the affairs of Ireland. But now we had got an Administration, the members of which had always shown themselves friends to Ireland, and they stood pledged to do what they could to promote its prosperity: he thought, therefore, that the new Administration ought to get time to arrange their movements before any thing should be said as to their future intention in regard to Ireland.

Mr. *Ruthven* said, that he was not desirous of troubling the House at any length, but he could not allow the opportunity to pass without expressing his opinion on the subject. Many individuals had told him that it would give them the greatest pleasure if he would undertake to support their petitions to this House, but he could not, consistently with the feelings he entertained for the interests of both countries, act in compliance with their wishes. At the same time he must tell the House, that it was in its power, and in that of his Majesty's Ministers, to put an end at once to these discussions. Let them, as the hon. and learned Member for Waterford said, do justice to Ireland, and we should hear no more of petition on petition for a repeal of the Union. He trusted, however, that Ireland would exercise patience, and allow Ministers time to consider what could be done further; and, on the other hand, he hoped Ministers would not delay relief too long, and that if they could not immediately assist the people of Ireland, they would at least let them know that they were not forgotten. He agreed with the hon. and learned member for Waterford, that the people of Ireland had not had justice done to them by the Parliament of this country. The people of England knew little of the wretched and abject state of the people of Ireland; they had not an opportunity of knowing it,—there was no Press to make them acquainted with the real state of the country,—Ireland had no means whatever of making its wants known. With regard to this discussion, he apprehended, be it right or wrong, that it would be of great advantage to the people of Ireland; and he hoped that, whenever a discussion of this nature took place, it would not be attended with taunts or provocations of which we had recently had several specimens. The more this question was agitated, the more it demanded from Government such exertions in favour of the people of Ireland as should produce real and beneficial results. What had been done for Ireland by former Parliaments was a proof that not much attention had been paid to its interests. He did not, indeed, see how it could by possibility be well attended to, for, with a population equal to more than one-half that of Great Britain, it had not one-sixth part of the representation of the empire vested in it. That Ireland had improved, he was ready to admit, but further improvement was required before it could arrive at that state of happiness and prosperity in which it ought to be placed. Ireland was better situated for purposes of commerce, than any other country in the world; it possessed every possible means of becoming rich, as far as local advantages were concerned,—

how was it, then, that the country was in its present deplorable condition? The two countries were very, very differently situated: England had grown old in riches and prosperity—Ireland was destitute of every comfort; while those who had the means in their power of increasing its welfare, remained voluntary exiles from its shores. Living much in Ireland, he was able to affirm, that a very good feeling subsisted between the two countries, and he must also say, that he had witnessed a good feeling generally in that House, when the affairs of Ireland had been under consideration; he, therefore, placed a strong dependance on Government, and even a firm reliance, that it would take immediate steps to adopt those measures in respect to Ireland, which were so much required to relieve its great distress.

Lord *W. Powlett* had heard many debates in that House on Irish subjects, and night after night debates on petitions for a repeal of the Union. He could not see on what the complaints of the Irish people were founded, as compared with the people of England. They were lighter taxed; in fact, he might say, they were not taxed at all, for they paid no assessed taxes. If hon. Members for Ireland complained, why did they not introduce measures to that House? For his part, he did not know what Ireland needed more than she had already obtained. But whatever she needed, it was the business of Irish Members to introduce suitable measures, not complain that it was not done by others.

Mr. *R. More O'Ferrall* said, he would not trouble the House with any observations of his on the present occasion, were it not necessary to reply to the speech of the noble Lord who spoke last, and not leave uncontradicted the assertion that Ireland was not taxed; he begged to assure the noble Lord, that Ireland was not only taxed highly at the present moment, but would have been taxed more by his Majesty's late Government, and with the concurrence of the late Parliament, were it not that the demise of his late Majesty prevented the measure being carried through that House. Ireland had no reason to be obliged either to the Government or Parliament for her escape on that occasion, and if she was not more taxed, it was only because she was unable to bear more taxation. The assessed taxes, it was true, were taken off, not so much as a measure of relief, but because they produced so little as not to be worth the expense of collecting. The noble Lord said, he did not know what Ireland wanted. That was the only strong argument he had yet heard urged in that House in favour of the repeal. What! was it possible, after all the evidence given before so many committees, after the repeated declarations of Ministers themselves, of the wants and misery of Ireland, of which the noble Lord was ignorant, that such a declaration could be made. That showed distinctly that the noble Lord paid little attention to the country which he was so often called on to legislate for. If Irish Members did not introduce specific measures of relief, it was owing to the assurance they had so often received, that Government would take up the subject. When some hon. Member did introduce motions to repeal obnoxious laws, they were met by strong majorities against them, of which it was not unreasonable to suppose the noble Lord formed one. He trusted this was the last time any hon. Member would rise in that House to assert that Ireland was not taxed, and the more so when so little informed on the subject as the noble Lord appeared to be.

Lord *Althorp* said, that Ministers felt the deepest interest for the condition of Ireland, nor could he agree that either that House or the Government had neglected the affairs of that part of the empire; for since he had had a seat in Paliament, a very great portion of the time of the House had been occupied every Session in discussing subjects relating to Ireland. It was right that this should be the case, for the attention of Parliament, and of the executive Government, ought to be peculiarly applied to Ireland, as it was a part of the empire that most demanded relief. For himself, he had no property in Ireland, and no personal connexion with it whatever, and yet he had always attended as closely to the affairs of that country as any Irish Member. It was he who had moved for the committee on the state of Ireland; and from the labours of which so much benefit was acknowledged by all parties to have been derived, particularly as the Report of the Committee had produced such a change of feeling upon the subject. He could assure the House, that his Majesty's Ministers were duly impressed with the importance of Irish affairs, and would pay to them the utmost attention.

Sir *G. Warrender* thought himself as

much bound, as a Member of Parliament, to attend to Irish affairs as if he were a native of that country.

Mr. *O'Connell* regretted to hear much of what had fallen from hon. Members. With regard to the observations of the member for Abingdon, who had stated from his own peculiar sources of information, that those persons who urged the repeal of the Union appeared to him chargeable with sinister motives; he could not avoid complaining that the hon. Member should so traduce those men. The hon. Member should have made some inquiry before he ventured to make such a charge. The Irish people had much confidence in the new Administration, but their confidence would never induce them to give up the question of a repeal of the Union. A noble Lord (Lord Wm. Powlett) had said, that Ireland was not grievously taxed. The noble Lord must have strange ideas of taxation. Ireland was taxed one million to Grand Juries, two millions for the support of the Church establishment, and four millions were paid into the Treasury. Was this taxation not grievous?—In addition,—although to a certainty the tax was paid in England,—the duties on tea were to be included. They were not considered as part of the Irish revenue, but they were substantially so. Since the war, thirty millions of taxation had been taken off England, while only 500,000*l.* had been removed from Ireland. This showed the want of a resident Legislature. But since this sum was taken off, 300,000*l.* had been added. It had been asked by the noble Lord, why did not the Irish Members propose some measures of relief for Ireland? Twice had he brought forward questions of great importance to Ireland, and on each occasion he was left in a minority. The two questions were, the Subletting and Vestry Acts; and on the occasions of both divisions, the noble Lord voted against him. Could it be urged that Ireland had not the means of forming a local Legislature? Ireland had in former times flourished under her own Legislature, and why should she not do so now? From the year 1782, until the Union, Ireland was never in such a state of prosperity—far, far different from what she was now. The equalization of duties had ruined her manufactories. Until the Union should be repealed, he despaired of seeing Ireland flourish, and he implored his Majesty's Ministers to consider well the measure.

Sir *Robert Wilson* said, that the hon. and learned member for Waterford had said a great deal, on various occasions, of the happiness and prosperity enjoyed by Ireland under its Parliaments; he had described its state then as one of the highest prosperity, and the hon. and learned Member affirmed, that the greatest benefits had accrued to Ireland from being represented by its own Parliament. He could take upon himself to say, that a more unreal picture was never drawn than that of the prosperous state of Ireland under that Parliament. A more miserable country never shocked the eye of civilized humanity than Ireland under that system,—a more miserable country never existed than it was at that time. He could bring the most incontestible proofs of what he asserted. The greatest abuse of legislative power prevailed—monopoly of every kind existed to the greatest extent—the most venal patronage that can possibly be conceived was tolerated—and a total neglect of the interests of the people existed to a degree that debased and disgraced the country. Of these facts he was an eye-witness, having been much in Ireland at the time of the existence of this much talked of Parliament. From Ireland he went to Egypt; and he could assure the House, that wretched as were the natives of that country—miserable as the Egyptian was,—in fact, he was as abject, poor, and miserable as a human being could be who had the means of existence,—it was his feeling, and the feeling of every one who accompanied him there, that the Egyptians were not so abject, poor, miserable, and indescribably wretched, as the Irishmen whom they had left. In such a state of things, the Union was hailed, not as the means of usurping the dominion over Ireland, not as the means of checking its prosperity, but as a measure of mercy and benevolence; it was hailed with satisfaction, because it was considered that it would be the means of correcting the abuses which existed, and it was the wish of every intelligent man to afford esential relief to that suffering country. If the country was in such a state as the hon. and learned Member represented, what induced the people to rebel? Who were those that engaged in the Rebellion, and what induced them to rise against the Government? It was not on account of religion,—the Catholic Church did not patronize the rebellion in any way. What, then, induced the people to commit the outrages they did? Why, the dreadful state of the country. The Rebellion, taken by itself, without any other fact, was a sufficient proof of the wretchedness of the people. He could refer the hon. and learned member for Waterford to documents which would convince him that his statement was founded in error,—which would prove to him that the country was not in the flourishing state he described. What Ireland now wanted was repose, which might permit capital to flow into the country, and be the means of furnishing employment to those peasants who at present sought it on our shores, beating down the price of our labour in our market. If the country, however, were to be kept in a state of agitation—the higher classes would not return to it, and the peasantry must remain destitute of employment. As long as there was nothing but division and discord, absenteeism would continue. An Irish gentleman naturally said, "I would rather live in peace on a crust of bread than live in plenty in a country in a state of anarchy." Would any hon. Member take his wife and children to a country in a state of perpetual agitation? If there were peace in Ireland—if they would allow the experiment to be made, whether, with the country in a state of peace, absenteeism would not be removed, they would soon enjoy the beneficial results of the trial: on the contrary, if the agitation of this question were persisted in, he was convinced that the country would be plunged into even greater calamity than it had yet suffered. It was not pursuing a fair course towards the friends to the Catholic Bill, that immediately after it was passed, Irish Members should say, "You have granted one measure of conciliation, but that is nothing; we require from you further measures of conciliation; the passing of that bill was only one step in your advance." What would be the consequence of that? Why, they would be reproached by their countrymen for having led them into that measure. This was not honest in the hon. and learned member for Waterford and his friends. If the Union were repealed, we should find ancient animosities renewed with additional violence; the ancient feuds between Catholics and Protestants would be rekindled; and the next step would be, an attempt to establish Catholic ascendancy,—a measure that must necessarily be attended, not only with spoliation of every description, but with all the horrors of a civil war. The hon. and learned member for Waterford—for the petition was understood to be his in fact—had much better withdraw it, and give a fair opportunity to the government to carry its plans into execution for the advantage of Ireland. The hon. and learned member for Waterford had raked up the circumstances of former times for the purpose of representing Englishmen as the most cruel and oppressive tyrants: he had put his hand to a charge of the most unwarrantable description that could possibly be made; he had not only traduced the militia regiments which served in Ireland as enemies to that country, he had also traduced one of the greatest ornaments of this country in the most unwarrantable manner; he had declared that the individual to whom he alluded—a nobleman whose character could bear even the calumny of the hon. Member—who was as remarkable for his benevolence of conduct as his love of justice—the hon. and learned Member accused the Marquis Cornwallis—of having sold the life of a criminal to the yeomanry of the county of Wicklow, in order to obtain their assent to the Union. That was the most unwarrantable, unfounded, and unjustifiable accusation that was ever made by any man in existence. The character of that noble individual belonged to his country. If he had the honour of being a relative of his, he would compel the hon. and learned member for Waterford to establish his charge. There never was a man who joined the standard of rebellion more deserving of punishment—there never was one who better deserved the vengeance of the law—than the individual whom the Marquis Cornwallis was said to have sold to the yeomanry of Waterford.

Mr. *Maberly* was desirous, as a pointed allusion had been made to him by the hon. and learned member for Waterford, of saying a few words in explanation. He begged to state, that he received his information from a person as well acquainted with Ireland as the hon. Gentleman. There could, however, be no doubt, that if agitation were put an end to, and Ireland were allowed to repose, prosperity would begin. How could capital flow into a country where there was no security for its inhabitants? Would absentees return to a place where they were prevented from living in quiet? Let the hon. and learned member for Waterford deny the truth of the proposition if he could. Individuals of property would not return to Ireland until they could live in a state of security. He did not accuse the hon. and learned member for Waterford, individually, of being the cause of the agitation. The hon. and learned Member was not, however, correct in his statement of the taxation of Ireland, when he contradicted the noble Lord. He wished to see taxation reduced; but he must say, that Ireland, proportionately, was not so much taxed as England; the people of the former being taxed at 12*s*. per head, while those of the latter paid 3*l*. 12*s*. each; not including local taxation, amounting from twenty to twenty-five per cent more without tithes. How then could the hon. Gentleman say, that Ireland was as much taxed as England? He had always been mindful of the interests of Ireland, and always would be a supporter of her interests; but for that very reason, he was opposed to the agitation of this question, which only increased the distresses of Ireland.

Mr. *Leader* was of opinion, that the hon. members for Southwark and for Waterford met on pretty nearly equal terms—they had both been aspirants for popular favour—they had both assisted in fanning the flame of patriotism in their respective countries, and giving it a practical direction; and the gallant General could not consistently condemn altogether in another the course which he had, in some degree, pursued himself. He regretted deeply that his hon. friend the member for Waterford, should have a stronger claim to allowance for anger and irritation than any other public man. After being returned for an independent county, an Act of Parliament was made to exclude him from the highest honour which his countrymen could confer. The beardless boys of his profession, and the incompetent men had, in unnecessary and extraordinary numbers, been advanced before him; and though nothing could deprive him of public support, yet everything had been done, even whilst engaged in the legitimate and glorious endeavour to emancipate millions of his countrymen, which the most rancorous personal hostility could devise, to deprive his family and himself of the fair emoluments of his splendid talents and acquirements. Minds which could allow personal animosities to stand in the way of international interests never could expand to the consideration of the interests of a great empire. It had been the fashion to undervalue Ireland; and when Gentlemen called on his friend the member for Waterford, to name a day for the discussion of the Repeal of the Union, it would be well that they should recollect, that the magnitude and importance of the question were too great to allow it to be forced into premature debate. Until the peace, Ireland had, as appears from official documents, been an exporting and importing country with Great Britain, to the amount of twenty-one millions annually. It was stated by Mr. Foster, twenty years ago, that the remittances to absentees exceeded three millions, and they had most probably greatly increased. Absenteeism was a perennial abstraction of so much of the national income, and impoverished the classes dependent on labour, in the same degree as a sum of equal amount, when dispensed by resident landlords, vivifies and cherishes domestic industry in all its departments. The produce of Ireland was of little value to the husbandman after being thrashed out for the payment of local burthens and remittances to the absentee. The high aristocracy were all absentees, and too many of the gentry had followed their example. It was immaterial to Ireland how the money was spent. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, from 1802 to 1816, had drawn from five to eight millions annually from a country which, before this Union, never paid more than one million in taxation, the rest being supplied by lottery, and a tax on absentees. Whilst the war rents were paid, Ireland was a picture pleasing to behold; and whilst double the present prices for the produce of land secured the content of the land-owners, and a magnificent patronage existed in a gorgeous Church establishment, the government of Ireland was not very difficult to be conducted. When Gentlemen came down to this House after rehearsing and preparing speeches against the member for Waterford, and taunted him with all the agitation and all the discontent in Ireland, they shewed that they were wholly ignorant of the country; and they must bend to the labour and the drudgery of making themselves acquainted with the facts before they could understand it. Was no allowance to be made for the discontent and embarrassment occasioned by the reduction of prices of landed produce by the transition from war to peace? Was no allowance to be made for that discontent being aggravated by the change from a paper to a metallic currency? Was no allowance to be made for the discontent occasioned by the necessity of transmitting double the quantity of produce to England to pay absentees the same rent as before those reductions? He admitted the discontent, but could any one expect it to be otherwise, who knew that the resources of Ireland consisted in its trade of provisions, the price of which had fallen half, — in cattle which had for many years been sold at a most ruinous reduction,—and in its corn-trade, which had also experienced a reduction in value corresponding with that of its other exports,—and in the linen manufacture, which had almost disappeared; would any one, he asked, expect it to be otherwise who knew that the resources of Ireland had been diminished one-half, while her wants had augmented. He believed in the existence of great discontent, but it was impossible for any man to see a large circle of friends, and extensive family connexions, suffering from poverty and want, and not be discontented. Ireland not possessing the affluence of England, the calamities he had enumerated had fallen on her with a deadly and almost insuperable pressure. Allow him to tell the gallant General, that personal rancour was a bad restorative, either to the health of a State or the complacency of an individual—that abuse would not heal what magnanimity, diligence, industry, and honesty, might possibly alleviate, —and allow him also to say, that when public emergencies, and when public interests loudly called for it--enmities ought to be forgotten, and personal asperities discountenanced. It had been re-echoed again and again, that if the member for Waterford were to hold his tongue, no one else would open his mouth to agitate the question of the Union. He did not agree in that opinion. The means of Ireland were unequal to her burthens; a crisis was approaching when engagements could not be kept, and both wisdom and humanity, demanded that every possible national resource should be developed. If a flame was already spreading in Ireland, he knew no way of quenching it but by accumulating benefits, and by a demonstration of increased affection. For the last fifteen years, he had advocated the principle that England had as deep an interest in the prosperity of Ireland, as Ireland itself. If they compared the trade of Ireland with Great Britain, and the trade of Great Britain with the rest of the world, they would find that the trade of the eastern coast of Ireland, from Waterford to Belfast, was equal to the most valuable trade which England had with the south of Europe, namely, that with the Italian States; the trade of Cork and Limerick was equal to the trade with France; the trade with the rest of Ireland was fully equal to that of Spain and Portugal. The ambition of his life was to cultivate the resources of Ireland; to make her a partner in the concern of the empire, whom it was impossible to overlook, and to obtain for her a fair share of profits and advantages. He had often contrasted the trade of Ireland, in times of Irish prosperity, with the trade of the north of Europe, the south of Europe, and with the trade of the East Indies, or of America and the West-Indies; and he could assert fearlessly, that Ireland held a proud, and, in point of value, a successful comparison. It had occurred to him, that it would not be impossible to make up the deficiency of the price of Irish commodities by an increase in the quantity. If for twenty years he had devoted his leisure to supply a remedy for the frightful depreciation of the prices of landed produce, by extending the sphere of improvement, it would be hard if he required more than twenty days to consider whether great legislative attention and honesty might not correct the evils which long misrule and criminal neglect had created. His principles had not been hastily taken up, and would not be lightly abandoned. He had obtruded himself on no constituency—he had, as a public man, no claim on his country, but his attachment to her interests, and his endeavours to promote amelioration and improvement. His life had been devoted to political principles which had at length obtained a triumph. He begged leave to press on the attention of the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the reduced value of the landed produce of Ireland—the decay of manufactures—the little dependence which was to be placed on the dreams about British capital, the embarrassed state of landed property in Ireland, the impoverished condition of the people, the absence of the great landed proprietors, the admitted recurrence of periodical distress, the weight of local taxation, the increased pressure of tithes and other exactions, and the now urgent necessity of, at all events, removing, to the fullest extent, every reasonable and admitted ground of complaint. If that were not done, if the distress of Ireland were not alleviated, no man living could contemplate without dismay and sorrow the consequences to which the present discontent must inevitably lead.

O'Gorman Mahon said, the measure which was the subject of the prayer of this petition would require, and he trusted would receive, from an English Legislature that consideration and attention which every measure should receive, when acknowledged to be of considerable importance. He should not, however, be doing his duty to the persons who had requested him to support their petition—to those who had been entitled designing and interested men, if he did not state, that the thousands who had been so designated, and whom he had seen assemble for no other purpose than to benefit their country—were as patriotic as the hon. Member who censured them. [Mr. *Maberly;* I did not say thousands, but merely a few, who agitated.] He would give the hon. Member's argument the benefit of those interested few, since he exempted the many from the charge, and he would tell him, that thousands in Ireland had pledged themselves to make this the only Irish question of importance till it was attained. He would give the hon. Member the few to whom he had alluded, and would then add, that there were millions with those thousands in Ireland, who had, and who could have, no other motives in agitating the question, than a principle of love and affection for their native land. Accepting these as admitted premises, it would not be unimportant to inquire how it happened that the gallant knight should have made, in the few observations he addressed to the House, so great an historical mistake as he had made. The hon. and gallant Member observed, in reference to the Irish rebellion, that it was caused by distress; but if the gallant knight would only refer to the page of history, he would find that he was incorrect. [Sir *Robert Wilson* had said, that the Rebellion itself was a proof that great distress existed.] So he understood the hon. and gallant Member, and he was, therefore, prepared to contend, that the distress which existed in Ireland was not the cause of that rebellion. It would appear, upon an inquiry into the facts, that the distress at that period was not greater than at present; and he had no doubt, that distress had increased tenfold since the Union, taking into consideration the subsequent increase of population. The latter had increased many-fold, and there had been at the same time a proportionate diminution of the resources which had been previously available to the maintenance of the people and their employment. Absenteeism had increased—the people suffered mighty exactions — resources were drawn from the country, which, if retained, would be sufficient to maintain their families—a fund to sustain foreign luxury was torn from the people, was wrung from their distresses, and all they cried for was, that the Legislature would grant them the means of obtaining future competence. Was the hon. and gallant Member aware of the exactions in the shape of tithes to support a Protestant Church where there was no Protestant? Was the gallant Member aware that those exactions had arrived at a magnitude in amount that had never been paralleled? Was the gallant Member aware that the complaint of the Irish was, that all these exactions were drawn from them without their receiving any benefit in return? They were stripped of money on the pretext of repairing churches where no churches existed,—for building churches where no churches were ever built, — for the administering of sacred elements where there was no parson to administer, and no Protestant to receive them! Could hon. Members, being aware of these extortions be surprised that Ireland was discontented? But at the period the gallant Member alluded to, Ireland was systematically goaded into rebellion by Government tools, the ready agents of mischief. The use to be made of history was, to inquire into the causes of evil events, in order to apply the proper remedy, should they threaten again. The Rebellion was the result of a plan of the then Government, concocted to press that country into a premature revolt, in order to promote the carrying of the Union. If rebellion had not been excited, would those extortions he had referred to have been existing now? Would the people have been stripped of their food as they were at present? Would an Irish Parliament have endured, that so much of the produce of the land should have been taken from it without any return? Would Ireland have ever allowed such a grievance as tithes to exist, without a proportionate advantage being conferred in return? There was no man acquainted with the real state of Ireland now, and with its history, who would not be ready to admit that those frightful scenes of distress and calamity that had since occurred would not have happened if there had been an Irish Parliament. Could it be said, that Ireland was not capable of governing herself? To that he would reply, by referring to the great men who had been subtracted from that country, and who had assisted with honour, credit, and success, to govern elsewhere. Before he concluded, he wished to bear testimony to the courtesy and attention with which Irish business was listened to in that House. He would say, in justice to hon. Members, that he had met with kindness and attention which he had little anticipated. Not only had Irish Members and Irishmen had fair play, but Englishmen had been occupied more with Irish affairs than with any other, and he sincerely trusted that Ireland would never fail in gratitude, but that the hearts and hands of his honest countrymen would be always ready to support a country in alliance that had listened to their complaints. He would call on the House to mark how Ireland stood at present, with all these causes of complaint which he had enumerated. Captain Rock had transferred his commission to Captain Swing. Ireland was tranquil! England disturbed! He should, as he always had done, disclaim that popularity which might be had by throwing himself into the scale with any popular man, but no consideration should induce him to withdraw his support from any measure of benefit to Ireland, come from what quarter it might. No personal inconvenience, no feeling of personal wrong should operate against his sense of duty. He would always support measures, and not men; and he was certain that a speedy settlement of this great question would have the effect of promoting the interest of both countries. The same evils afflicted Ireland — the same wretchedness prevailed as on former occasions, and yet was Ireland in a state of tranquillity. The gallant Officer said, that Ireland was agitated; but by what species of agitation? There was no violent attack upon private property—no destruction of the instruments of husbandry or industry—no destruction of merchandise — no riotous assemblages marching by day and night through the country, bearding the authorities, and telling them that they would have their own measures and their own prices—and no demanding of money with threats of violence. The conduct of the Irish was the direct reverse; Irishmen came respectfully to the bar of that House and implored it to inquire into and remedy their wrongs. They did not attempt to intimidate, but merely requested a redress of their grievances, and the contrast was highly favourable to Ireland. Would it not suffice that men should be exposed to starvation equal to that now complained of in England, to give them a just claim to instant remedy? Yet what Englishmen complained of, and called starvation, would be absolute feasting to the poor of Ireland. They would be satisfied if they could get only half what Englishmen had. They had three or four meals a day, but give Pat the certainty of only two, or even one meal a day for himself and wretched family, and he was content, if not cheerful. The gallant Member alluded to a late measure as not having had the beneficial effect that was anticipated from it; but was it nothing, in these perilous times, that this measure had kept the people tranquil? and he hoped the hon. member for Waterford would still use the unbounded influence he possessed in keeping them so. Contrary to what had been asserted, he would maintain that Englishmen need not be afraid of carrying their capital into Ireland, for it would give them an ample return. But the gallant Member, in speaking of the Catholic measure, said, that a war would occur in Ireland on the repeal of the Union,—that the Catholics would combine for the purpose of driving the Protestants out of the country—such was the sense of what he said—into the waves of the Atlantic? There never was a greater calumny, or a more unfounded imputation cast upon any body of men. The Catholics never would participate in such a project, and even a feeling of hostility against the Protestants would meet with the reprehension of every Catholic of every class. Catholics, both layman and clergyman, would unite to repel any attempt to prevent Catholics and Protestants from living in the bonds of amity, affection, and concord. Such was his opinion; and he would have preferred being a slave for ever, to accepting liberty with such a base project as that in view.

Sir *John Bourke* expressed a decided opinion against the repeal of the Union; but he could not hear the observations of the hon. member for Abingdon, without rising to deny that the agitation in Ireland was caused by interested and designing persons He must admit that many of the ablest and most honorable men in Ireland supported that measure, and he feared, by not supporting it, he had lost so much of the favour of his constituents as to endanger his success on a future occasion. He entirely agreed with his hon. friend, the member for Clare, and denied that the object of the Catholics of Ireland was to tear down the Protestant establishment, and set up their own in its place. He believed in his heart that the Catholics had no such desire. He ever should, as a Catholic, discountenance any attempt to give power to the Clergy of the religion which he professed. The Catholics only desired that their religion should enjoy the same impartial protection as all religions did in America and France.

Sir *Robert Bateson* hoped that his Majesty's Ministers would take the state of Ireland into their serious and immediate consideration. There was one point to which he wished to advert, and it was this—after the passing of the Relief Bill, confident hopes were entertained on all hands, that peace and tranquillity would be restored to Ireland; it was producing such effects, till the agitation of the repeal of the Union commenced; it had produced the best effects till that arose. As a resident of the north of Ireland, he could assure the House, and the hon. member for Waterford, that this agitation was again arousing bitter feelings of hostility and party dissension in that part of Ireland. The party contests in that part of the country were again commencing, in consequence of that agitation. He spoke advisedly when he said, for he knew that the fact was so, that the Orangemen of Ireland would rally again—that they would make this a party-question, and that the former dissensions between Catholics and Protestants in the north of Ireland would be again fomented on account of this question. He knew that such had been the case already, and he would therefore implore the hon. member for Waterford to exercise the influence which he certainly had in Ireland, to stop the agitation of this question. Whether the Union was or was not a good measure, it had now existed thirty years, and a repeal of it could not be effected without revolution and a bloody civil war. He implored the hon. Member to stop that agitation, and to exert the great talents he possessed in some other way. It was in his power to stop it, and unless he did so, he would be answerable for the blood which would be spilt. The hope of the return of tranquillity to Ireland had been cherished, and he believed that party feeling had subsided until the agitation of this question within the last few months. He wished as well to his country as the hon. Member, and he was as independent as he was, and he therefore opposed this agitation, because he thought it ruinous to Ireland. He spoke for the good of the country, and he would tell the hon. Member, that in the province of Ulster, every respectable man —every man of common sense—every man who had any thing to lose—men of all religions, deprecated the agitation of this question, because the people of Ireland were easily excited concerning it; and because that excitement was most injurious to Ireland they opposed it. He thought the repeal of the Union was a most idle and mischievous measure, and that the agitation of it would be attended with the worst consequences. He repeated his conviction, that if it were carried, it would only produce separation, revolution, and bloodshed. He again implored the hon. member for Waterford to stop the discussion of it. He thanked the House for the attention with which he had been heard, and he was sure that in an Irish Parliament greater attention would not be shown to an Irish question. He was ashamed to say, as an Irishman, that since the beginning of the Session they had discussed nothing else but Irish questions, and heard nine Irish Members every night. If the hon. member for Waterford possessed the unbounded influence which the hon. member for Clare said he did over the people of Ireland—that hon. Member, he believed, said, that the people of Ireland were in his hands, and that he could wind them as he wished;—if he possessed that influence, and there was no doubt that his influence was very great, he implored him to exercise it in the stopping the agitation of this question. He would call the attention of Government to the meetings which were now being held in Dublin. It was not to be wondered at that such excitement was easily created amongst the lower orders of the people in Ireland. He was sure that the repeal of the Union would not benefit them or the country, but that bad as they were in Ireland, it would throw them back twenty years, and make every thing worse. He trusted, therefore, that the hon. Member would use his influence in stopping the agitation, and that he would employ his great talents in effecting some practical good for Ireland. The curse of absenteeism was the only argument he ever heard urged in support of the repeal. He repudiated the absurd doctrine of the political economists, that absentees were not an evil to a country; absenteeism was the misery of Ireland, but a repeal of the Union would not remedy it. He thanked the member for Abingdon for the observations which he had made; that hon. Member had truly said, that Ireland only wanted repose to induce the British capitalists to invest their money in Ireland. If tranquillity was restored they would much rather send it to Ireland, which was so advantageously situated to receive it, than send it to South America and other distant countries. They only wanted repose in Ireland, and British capital would flow into it. He again called the attention of the Government to the meetings which were taking place in Dublin; the most inflammatory speeches and statements were made at those meetings, which must have the worst effects upon a starving population. Not later than a week ago speeches were made at one of those meetings full of sedition, if not of treason. An appeal was made to physical force—the working classes were told that they were the men who could carry it—that they were the men who could work the cannon—and that it was by them that the Union flag would be taken down from the Castle of Dublin, and the green standard hoisted in its place. If such things were allowed to go on, there was an end to all government, and if such conduct was suffered, the worst consequences would follow from it.

Colonel *O'Grady* said, that the statement which had fallen from the hon. Member, as to the effects produced by this agitation, should not be allowed to go uncontradicted, as it would produce greater mischief in Ireland than any thing which had been said that night. He denied the statement that party feelings and dissensions had been again brought into play in Ireland.

Sir *Robert Bateson* explained, that he had only deprecated the agitation of the repeal of the Union, as it would be productive of religious animosities.

Petition laid on the Table. In moving that it be printed,

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that the gallant member for Southwark had again attacked him; but on the three points on which he attacked him he was ready to meet him. He said, that he (Mr. O'Connell) had traduced the English militia: he had never done so in any genuine document that had come from him, and he had not charged it with any thing that he was not able to prove. If the gallant Member would point out any thing untrue with regard to the English militia, which had been stated by him (Mr. O'Connell,) he would retract it. His assertion with regard to Byrne, and the conduct of Lord Cornwallis, he was ready to prove at any time; he could prove Lord Cornwallis had made the compromise he had stated in that instance with the yeomanry. He meant, in spite of the advice of hon. Members, to continue the agitation for the repeal of the Union. He was grateful for emancipation, but he had always said at Catholic meetings, that he sought emancipation with a view to get back their Parliament, and at a meeting in 1810 he had offered to the Dublin Corporation to give up the demand for emancipation if they would join for a repeal of the Union. The repeal of the Union was the object of his whole political life.

Sir *Robert Wilson* said, that the previous crimes of Byrne rendered his execution indispensable, and he had documents in his possession which would prove the incorrectness of the assertions of the hon. and learned Member.

Petition to be printed.

PENSIONS RECENTLY GRANTED.] Lord *Althorp*, in moving that the report of the Committee of Supply be brought up, gave notice, that in the Committee of Ways and Means he should move for a Supply of 1,800,000*l.* for certain charges, the same as if the demise of his late Majesty had not occurred; and that on Monday next he should move for leave to bring in a Bill, to be passed rapidly through the House, to enable Magistrates to perform their functions after the 26th of this month, Ministers having omitted to issue Commissions of the Peace for a date beyond the 26th instant.

Mr. *R. Gordon* wished to take that opportunity of calling the attention of the House to the supplementary Civil List, which added 3,000*l.* to the List of Pensions, some of which had been granted since the death of his late Majesty, and when, in fact, no Civil List existed, and no Pension could be legally bestowed. He found that the late Ministers, after they had ceased their functions, had granted the following pensions:—On the 21st of November last, a pension to Mary Rae, wife of the late Lord Advocate of Scotland, of 660*l.* per annum; three pensions, granted on the 16th of November, to T. K. Holmes of 500*l.* a-year; to E. Drummond of 250*l.*; and to Algernon Greville, of 250*l.*

Lord *Althorp* did not think himself called upon to say anything on the subject, as those pensions were granted by his predecessors before he or his friends came into Office, and he had had nothing to do with them, nor did he consider himself bound to enter upon the conduct of his predecessors.

Sir *George Warrender* said, one of the pensions was granted to the wife of the late Lord Advocate of Scotland; and he must say, that learned Lord had long performed his duty well, and had but last year brought in a Bill which abolished many offices, some one of which would probably have been given to himself. He was confident that grant would be favourably regarded in Scotland, and he believed in the country at large; the manner of making it might be open to observation, but not from him.

Mr. *Courtenay* said, it was usual for Ministers going out of office to grant pensions, and he thought the practice was perfectly justifiable, as it was making provision for persons whose services deserved it, and who would certainly have been provided for if Ministers had remained in Office.

Mr. *R. Gordon* said, that his observation applied only to the mode of granting the pensions. He thought Ministers ought to be closely watched in these respects.

Lord *Althorp* said, that it was perfectly right that the present Ministry should be watched—and closely watched—by that House and by the public. It was most desirable that every Government should be watched, for the temptations to do wrong were numerous. As he was upon the subject of pensions, he would merely say, that the recent arrangements in Ireland could not have been made with any view to serve the friends of Ministers, for they benefitted persons who were not their friends, and directly the reverse. The Government had felt it essential to have persons in Ireland in whom they could repose the strictest confidence. He would not say more upon the subject until the arrangements were complete, and till then he felt confident that every hon. Member would be satisfied with what he had said.

Sir *R. Price* concurred in the opinion that every Government should be watched with the utmost vigilance.

Sir *G. Warrender* was disposed to watch the present Ministers with entire confidence, especially with reference to the noble Lord (Althorp), who in all the relations of private life had acquired the esteem, the admiration, and attachment of all who knew him, and whose integrity and whole conduct in public life were equally respected by all parties.

Sir *R. Bateson* thought the pensions ought to be reduced. The fine example of disinterestedness and of noble personal sacrifice set by the Marquis Camden, he was sorry to say, had been followed by nobody. The Marquis's conduct had excited the admiration of the whole country; but he regretted that in the House of Lords he was rather shunned as a bad example, than followed as a good one.

Report brought up.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, Dec. 13.

MINUTES.] Bills. On the Motion of Lord TENTERDEN, the Bill for the amendment of the Administration of Justice Bill, was read a third time and passed.

Petitions presented. For the abolition of Slavery by the Earl of SHAFTESBURY, from the Inhabitants of Lyme Regis, Dorchester, and other places:—By the Earl of ESSEX, from Melton Mowbray:—By the Earl of ROSSLYN, Lord KING, the Duke of DEVONSHIRE, and Earl GROSVENOR, from various parts of the Kingdom. For the repeal of the Duties on Sea-borne Coals, by the Earl of SHAFTESBURY, from Andover, and from Bideford:—By the Duke of NORFOLK, from Arundel. By the Duke of DEVONSHIRE, from Derby, for a reduction of the Stamp Duties upon Newspapers. For Parliamentary Reform, by Lord RADNOR, from Annandale:—the Duke of DEVONSHIRE, from Ridgeway:—By the Duke of RICH-

MOND, from Southover:—By Lord NAPIER, from a place in Scotland. By Lord GLENGALL, from various places in Ireland, for the Repeal of the Union.

RECENT APPOINTMENTS.] Earl *Grosvenor* said, that in rising to make a Motion pursuant to notice which he had given on Friday evening last, he would take that opportunity (as the Adjournment of the House was now near at hand) of submitting to their Lordships a few observations relative to transactions of some importance in the present state of the country. He thought it right to state, that he had had no communication on those subjects with any Members of his Majesty's Government, and that his remarks had none of the weight of official authority. It would be in the recollection of their Lordships that when a return of certain salaries and payments above 1,000*l.* a-year, was lately presented to them, there were several omissions in it, and among others, that of the salaries of the officers of the Court of Common Pleas and of this House. With respect to the first he would say nothing, but of the last he happened to know that it was no fault of the officers of this House, for they were ready to present the necessary papers, had it not been thought that, in point of form, they were not properly called upon to do so. Undoubtedly, it was desirable that those papers should be on their Lordships' Table, in order that they might know the emoluments of the officers of the House, as well as those of other public functionaries. He certainly was a party to procuring the regulations by which those emoluments were now governed, for nothing could be more unsatisfactory than their state before the last arrangement was come to. The office of Clerk of the Parliament was held, as their Lordships knew, by a respectable person, and it was thought fair to him, as well as proper in other respects, that there should be an examination into the matter. After pressing it on the attention of the Government for some time, it was at length determined that the subject should be referred to a Select Committee, and by that committee were the present regulations established. He was not a party to the arrangement, as to the emolument, though he did not mean to say, that the amount was too great, but merely that, whatever it might be, he was not a party to it. Their Lordships would recollect, in reference to the question of sinecures and useless places, agitated a long time back, that the returns shewed an amount of money uselessly expended greater than any person could have had any idea of, and further that there were many places granted in reversion, and which were kept up from generation to generation on the plea of vested interests. Unless a stop had been put to that system, the amount bestowed in places of that kind would have been still more alarming and astonishing than at present. But having repeatedly brought the subject under their Lordships' notice, it was at length taken into serious consideration, and the practice discontinued, thereby effecting a great saving to the public. Great hopes he knew were entertained of what might be effected by the present servants of the Crown, in the way of further reduction, but too much should not be expected from them, for however anxious they might be to spare the public purse, and reduce expenditure, they could not perform miracles. With the present enormous debt hanging over the country, be their savings what they might, they could not make any material impression on the general expenditure of the country. He therefore trusted, that their Lordships would not be too sanguine in their expectations. For these reasons, he had looked with almost cold indifference to the nomination of a committee to examine into a certain class of appointments, for he felt assured that nothing could be done which would afford effectual relief; besides, with whatever ability that committee might proceed, their Lordships knew too well the delays that had taken place in similar investigations,—indeed, in one committee a noble Lord had stated to him, that, after three years' labour, they had still done nothing. Their Lordships knew too much of the delays in the proceedings of committees to expect from that mode of investigation any immediate relief for the landed interest from the heavy load of taxation under which it was groaning. Look to the delay which must take place before any report to be acted upon could be made from the committee at present sitting on the Poor-laws. That committee might point out defects in the Poor-laws, —it might shew that they could be much amended,—that their administration could be bettered, and the condition of the poor ameliorated,—but its best work, in his opinion, would be, to prove, however defective the laws might be, that when gentlemen lived upon their own estates, instead of wasting their time and spending their money in the metropolis, or at watering-places abroad, the system had worked well; but although he expected little from the suggestions of the committee, whether they regarded machinery as affecting the condition of the poor, or the mal-administration of the laws, or the necessity of reducing expenditure, yet the very fact, that little would be done by the committee directly, might lead indirectly to a knowledge of that by which good could be done. Such an examination, shewing the hopelessness of effectual relief from any other quarter, might turn the public attention to resources frequently pointed out by writers on this subject, and which we must at last look in the face, however unpleasant it might be. Their Lordships' feelings might be shocked and revolted by the contemplation of the resources to be found in emigration, yet, "like the toad, evil and venomous," had they "a diamond in their head." If they looked at the present state of the country; their Lordships could not fail to be aware that the landed interest laboured under the severity of the taxation imposed upon it. It was impossible for the working class to get an advance of wages, for it was impossible that the farmer should have his land at a lower rate, and yet the landed interest support its present burthens. It was perfectly true, as had been stated over and over again, that the monied and landed interest should go together, and willing was the landed interest to do so, but it was unable to pay the demands now made on it. Should it, however, be borne down to ruin, what would be the fate of the monied interest? There could not be a doubt that if the landed interest fell, the monied interest would melt into thin air, and

> "Like the baseless fabric of a vision,
> Leave not a wreck behind."

Could it be said, however, that they were equally burthened? equally treated as if the fate of the one depended on the fate of the other? Numberless taxes had been imposed on land, from which it could not possibly escape, whilst funded property, however great, did not necessarily contribute one shilling to the burthens of the country. Many persons having money in the funds, Jews and Gentiles, inhabitants, not of England, but of France, of Russia, of Prussia, of Italy, Spain and Portugal, nay, even of Africa and America, although their property receives the protection of our laws, contributed not a farthing in the shape of taxes; and even those who resided in England need not, necessarily, contribute to the revenue of the country, but locking up their money in that famous box which was so much spoken of on a former evening, they might shelter it from those taxes which the land had no means of escaping. Let their Lordships, then, view the question fairly, candidly, and dispassionately, and consider whether the protection of so great a property as, the funds, as well as the protection of the land and every other species of property, should not bind the persons holding it, to contribute something to the maintenance of the laws by which it was protected. He would not say more on that point, but content himself with thus throwing it out for the consideration of their Lordships. He would then address himself to another topic of great importance to the country, though not, perhaps, of such permanent importance as that he had just touched upon; he referred to what passed on a former evening, when a question was put to a noble Earl (Bathurst) respecting an office just then vacant. He wished to state, fairly, candidly, and he hoped correctly, and certainly with no sort of ill feeling towards the noble Earl, what had taken place on that subject. Let him remind their Lordships, that on Monday, the 15th of November, there was a division in the other House of Parliament, which induced the noble Duke, then at the head of the Government, to tender his resignation to his Majesty, which tender the noble Duke informed their Lordships his Majesty had most graciously accepted. Mr. Buller, one of the Clerks of the Council, having suddenly died, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or Secretary for the Home Department, in the other House of Parliament, was asked if it had been filled up, and the answer was, that the right hon. Gentleman was not aware of the fact. The rumour first was, that the noble Earl who then held the place of the President of the Council had, with breathless haste, applied for the situation for a relation of the party who had last held it; but it was afterwards reported that he had asked it for his own son. This office, it should be recollected, had a salary of 2,000*l.* a-year attached to it, and was not usually considered a very efficient one, but rather of a patent nature.

Knowing that there might be some difficulty in abolishing or regulating that office, if it had been so disposed of, upon being made aware of the answer given to a question on the subject in the House of Commons, he thought it right to lose no time in putting a question to the noble Earl upon the subject, as he, of course, was the only person who could give a distinct and satisfactory answer. He asked the noble Earl, whether the office in question had been filled up, and his answer was to the effect, that the place had not been filled up, and immediately there was a general cheer throughout the House, and all the advocates of economy began to calculate upon a considerable saving in the office. There was much difficulty in getting at the truth in these matters, but it really would now appear, that the noble Earl's haste was such as had been described, for the office was given to his son immediately before the resignation of Ministers. He did not mean to say, that the noble Earl stated that the office had not been given, but his answer was such as to induce that belief in every one who heard him; he might, therefore, have kept "the word of promise to the ear," but he had "broken it to their Lordships' hopes." There was another point on which he should be glad to hear an explanation from the noble Lord opposite. It appeared from a supplementary list of pensions, salaries, &c. on the Civil List, presented to the other House of Parliament, that, on the 16th of November, the noble Duke having then tendered his resignation, and his Majesty having accepted it, three pensions were granted, and on the 20th of November another. He would not go into the merits of the persons to whom these pensions had been granted, but the three first, were one of 500*l.*, and two of 250*l.* a-year each, and the last of 660*l.*, granted to Lady Rae, four days after the dissolution of the Administration. Having said so much of the acts of the last Administration, he would take the liberty of saying a few words upon those of the Ministers now in office. A statement having been made that a pension was to be granted to the late Lord Chancellor of Ireland, the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack met it by a declaration that that change had not taken place, and that, if it did, no greater burthen would be thrown upon the country. He could not see how that should be made a matter of charge against the Government, for the Chancellor of Ireland, like the Chancellor of England, had always been considered a political Officer, and, upon changes of the Administration, it had always been customary, therefore, to change both. It did so happen that, at present, in consequence of this practice, there were two Ex-chancellors in the House, receiving considerable pensions, and he hoped they might long continue to ornament it. One of them is an octagenarian, as well as the late Irish Chancellor, and it could not be expected that their lives would be much prolonged, but still it must be a matter of regret that political changes should entail this sort of charge upon the country. He had heard, but he knew not whether it proceeded from good authority, that the late Chancellor of England was to be appointed to some judicial situation, in which his great abilities would be turned to the advantage of the country, which he should be very happy to see, as well as to effect a saving of 4,000*l.* a-year. The noble Earl near him (Grey) had been accused unjustly, of placing too many of his own relations and connexions in the Administration. It was natural that he should wish to have them as much about him as possible, in his responsible situation, and if properly qualified, as no doubt they were, to fill useful offices, there could be no fair objection to them? If the country had been loaded with useless offices and sinecures on their account, which was not the case, it would have been a different matter. He would, in conclusion, move for a return of the emoluments of the Officers of that House, only observing, that he did not propose to have the paper which had been laid before the other House of Parliament also laid before their Lordships, because they had access to all the printed papers of the other House, and the paper in question had been extensively circulated. The noble Earl then moved for "An Account of all Salaries, Profits, Pay-fees, and Emoluments, held and enjoyed by the Clerks and Officers of this House, between the 5th of January, 1829, and the 5th of January 1830, the total amount of which shall exceed 1,000*l.*, specifying with each Name the total Amount received by each Individual, and distinguishing the various Sources from which the same are derived."

The Marquis of *Lansdown* did not think it necessary to occupy the House by following the noble Earl in detail through all the observations which he (Earl Grosvernor) had made; but he would answer one of the questions of the noble Earl, because he was more competent than any other noble Lord to give satisfaction, both respecting the filling-up of the office to which that question referred, and the person who had been appointed to it, inasmuch as the appointment had rested with him. When he had received his Majesty's commands to undertake the duties of President of the Council, he received from his noble predecessor a communication to the effect that, on the 15th of the last month, when the office of clerk to the council became vacant by the death of Mr. Buller, his Majesty had signified to him (Lord Bathurst) that it was his pleasure that the place should be filled by Mr. Bathurst, to whom his Majesty's pleasure on that occasion was communicated. When he received that formal communication, he felt bound, whenever the place should be filled, to carry into effect the intentions of his Majesty respecting Mr. Bathurst, although no actual arrangement had been made respecting that gentleman by the late Ministers. At the same time he felt himself also at liberty to advise his Majesty to direct whatever reduction in the salary of that clerkship might seem consistent with the proper discharge of the duties. In justice to the noble Earl, he ought to inform their Lordships, that the letter which he received from that noble Earl, dated the 25th of November last, stated it to have been the intention of his Majesty's late confidential advisers to put the salary of the clerk to the council on a lower rate than that at which it had been formerly fixed. On receipt of that letter he did not think it necessary to communicate with Mr. Bathurst respecting the office until he should have considered what reduction ought to be made in the salary, consistently with a due regard to the public service, which he believed would admit of a very considerable reduction. The business of the council rendered it necessary that a clerk should always be present during its sittings; and although the presence of one clerk only was required, yet it was expedient to have either two clerks, or to appoint a deputy clerk. It was determined to reduce the salaries of the two clerks to 1,200*l.* a year, so that the duties of both should be performed at no greater expense than that to which the country was put for the salary of Mr. Buller alone. Besides, it was the intention of his Majesty's Government, whenever any person, having already a salary of 1,000*l.* a year or upwards, should receive an additional appointment of the value of 500*l.* annually, that allowance should merge in the 1,000*l.*; so that, as Mr. Bathurst held at present an office in the Exchequer, on account of which he received a salary of 500*l.* a year that sum should be deducted from his new stipend of 1,200*l.* a year. By that arrangement the actual saving effected in the clerkship to the council amounted to 1,700*l.* annually; and it was likely that opportunities would arise which would permit a still further reduction. Having answered the question of the noble Earl, he did not think that the House would expect him, on such a motion as had been submitted to their Lordships, to go into all the topics which the noble Earl had introduced. On these subjects the most satisfactory explanations had already been made to their Lordships, which was, tha the most unsparing retrenchment would be carried into effect. Retrenchment was always the duty of his Majesty's Government, but in times like the present, to use a word which he had already heard used on the same subject, it was their paramount duty. It was the determination of his Majesty's Ministers to cut off all useless expenses, but not to make a reduction in consequence of which the public service would be inadequately performed.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, that the delay in the appointment to the vacant offices, before the resignation of the late Administration, had been occasioned by their intention to reduce the salaries. With respect to the recently-granted pensions, to which a question of the noble Earl opposite had reference, their Lordships were aware that a considerable sum was always granted to his Majesty, to enable him to confer pensions upon those who were deserving: true it was, that the Civil List expired with the King; and it was also true, that at the time of the last demise of the Crown there was a considerable number of vacancies in the list of pensioners. He rather believed, that the more regular course would have been, not to have recommended his present Majesty to make any new grants out of the Civil List until the Act should have passed regulating its amount; but the custom unquestionably had been, to recommend the filling-up of vacancies as they occurred, without regard to the passing of the Civil List Act. He had followed the ordinary course, and had continued it from the accession of his Majesty to the hour when he relinquished the seals of office as First Lord of the Treasury. The noble Earl had said, that he (the Duke of Wellington) had come down to the House on the 16th November, and announced that he had resigned his office, and that his Majesty had been graciously pleased to accept that resignation; but the noble Earl forgot to state, that he had added, that he would retain the situation until a successor was appointed. He had, in fact, retained it until the noble Earl opposite, so worthily appointed, had relieved him in the following week. In the mean time he had recommended to the King the grant of certain pensions, and on the very day when he relinquished the seals, he had applied to his Majesty on the subject. For this course he felt that he was responsible: if he had done wrong he should deserve censure for that wrong doing; but he begged to say, that he was firmly convinced that their Lordships would not think he had erred with regard to any of the pensions which he had been the means of conceding. Two of them had been granted to gentlemen who, for three years, had done him the favour of acting as his private secretaries; and looking at the history of former Administrations, it would be seen how amply such gentlemen had always been provided for. They ought to be provided for, for this reason—that not a paper of any description came into his (the Duke of Wellington's) hands, from any office—and he had them from all offices—that did not, in some way or other, pass through those of one of his Secretaries. It was not fit, therefore, that individuals who possessed their official knowledge should remain without provision. He would tell their Lordships fairly, that having put down and discontinued on the establishment every office of every kind that became vacant while he was First Lord of the Treasury, and not having had—which he could assure the House was the truth—above two offices to give away, and those not amounting to 200*l.* a year each, he had not had the means of providing for his Secretaries; he had, therefore, asked the favour of his Majesty to grant them 250*l* a year each out of the Civil List. Another pension had been granted at his suggestion to a gentleman who had been for many years in the public service, under different Administrations, and as a vacancy occurred to that amount, we understoood his Grace to say 500*l.*, he hoped it would be thought that it had not been improperly disposed of. With respect to the last point noticed by the noble Earl he (the Duke of Wellington) had felt himself bound, if possible, to make some provision for that learned Lord, who was highly deserving, and who, he believed, had given universal satisfaction. He had therefore recommended him to his Majesty, and he had also recommended another gentleman, who had been taken into the service of his Majesty, and raised to the dignity of a Privy Councillor, and for whom, he was of opinion, that the King was in honour bound to provide. He had been elevated above the sphere from which he had been taken, and to that he could not return. In these various transactions he hoped their Lordships would think that he had done nothing improper or inconsistent with the usual practice of office.

Earl *Grey*, before offering a few remarks on the conversation which had, he must say, unexpectedly arisen, took occasion to state the inconvenience he felt, and which their Lordships must feel, from the introduction of conversations of this nature, of which no notice was given, and from discussion, like the present, which applied to no motion before the House, and embraced subjects, some of them known, and others unknown, and depending entirely upon rumour. A noble Lord had adverted to certain appointments said to be in contemplation; now he could not but complain that Ministers should be brought there to discuss the possibility of appointments which it was not pretended had been as yet made. In point of fact, he found the matter so inconvenient, that he really did not know how to address their Lordships on the various subjects which had been mooted, and on one of them, the weight of taxation on landed property, he should decline saying anything on that occasion. His noble friend (the Marquis of Lansdown) had satisfied their Lordships on the subject of the Clerk of the Council, and in relation to what had been said on the subject of pensions, the noble duke opposite had given a full explanation. He would not enter into any discussion of the point: with respect to two of the pensions it was impossible for him to offer any observation; in reference to the other two he should merely say, perhaps it would have been more regular if the noble Duke had not taken his Majesty's pleasure on the subject till the Civil List had been first granted. This the noble Duke himself admitted, and the observation appeared to him so true, that he really did not see, the Civil List having expired, upon what authority the pensions could have been granted. With respect to some legal appointments expected to take place, and a reference to which had been introduced, also without notice, on a former occasion, he must entreat the attention of the House for a few moments. On a former night a question had been put by the noble Earl on the cross-bench on this subject, and it was answered by his noble friend on the Woolsack. He regretted that he was not present on the occasion; but the question was put upon a day (Wednesday) generally understood not to be the most convenient for business, and on which therefore it was usual for many of their Lordships to relax in their attendance on the House. Acting in conformity with this understanding, and having been much occupied with public business elsewhere, he so far failed in his duty as to be absent from his place that evening, and therefore had no opportunity of replying to the noble Lord. But now that the subject had been revived, he must say a few words in relation to it; and he must commence by observing, that he did not think the legal and political capacity and character in which the Lord Chancellor, both in this country and in Ireland, must be considered, could very well be separated. This being the case, so long as an individual was to hold the office of Lord Chancellor, he must be elected to it by the existing Government; and whenever a change of Administration took place, there must be a change on the Chancery-bench. In Ireland, it was said, there need not be any such change with respect to the Chancellor; and it was asserted, that Sir Anthony Hart, whose great merits he should be among the first to acknowledge, was not in that situation which required any alteration to be made with respect to him. It was said, that the Irish Chancellor was not much of a political character, that Sir Anthony Hart had no political bias whatever, and that his was not a political appointment. He denied this, and maintained that it could not be said that the Irish Chancellor did not act in a high political capacity; and with respect to Sir Anthony Hart's appointment and proceedings in the very beginning of his official career, he (Earl Grey) very well recollected having seen his name subscribed to political proclamations, devised with a view to meet the disorders then existing in Ireland. Surely this clearly connected Sir Anthony Hart with politics. When he (Earl Grey) was raised to the situation which he then filled, it did occur to him, considering the state of Ireland, and all the evils existing in that country, which it was necessary to take steps to provide against,—it did occur to him,—not disputing Sir A. Hart's capacity and great legal acquirements,—that a Lord Chancellor should be appointed who would afford the Lord Lieutenant in council that assistance which the state of the country might require. In looking for such a person no individual occurred to his mind so proper as Lord Plunkett to fill the situation of Chancellor. He thought the appointment of that eminent individual calculated to conciliate a number of individuals—considering his acknowledged abilities, and great legal acquirements—considering that he had long lived in that country, and had acquired an extensive local knowledge of its interests. If he looked to the Catholics, he could not but suppose Lord Plunkett's appointment as Chancellor agreeable to them, who had long seen in him the able and zealous advocate of their cause; and among the Protestants, he thought he saw strong grounds for confidence in Lord Plunkett, who had invariably supported the Established Church with his best energies. Looking generally to all classes of the country, he thought the noble Lord must appear to them eminently qualified, by knowledge, experience, character, and abilities, to become the adviser of the Lord Lieutenant. It was under those circumstances that he had conceived the idea of the appointment; all the arrangements connected with which, however, were not as yet entirely completed, and he therefore deprecated the discussion of the subject as extremely inconvenient and irregular. At the same time that he felt it his duty to recommend to his Majesty a change in the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland, he was actuated by the strongest desire not to do anything that would bear the construction of a slight or harshness towards Sir A. Hart. But he did think it necessary to recommend a change. The alteration had been complained of as entailing an additional burthen of 4,000*l.* a year on the country. Now he should regret extremely if the change (necessary as he considered it) could not be made without adding, in however trifling a degree, to the public expenditure; but, he asked, would that be a wise economy which should prevent Ministers, for the sake of saving a few thousands per annum, from making a change which they considered extremely desirable? However, as a desire to effect all the saving practicable was uppermost in the minds of Ministers, and as they wished, in making the arrangement, to adhere to this resolution, perceiving that an additional burthen of 4,000*l.* (or 3,600*l.* English currency) would be imposed on the public, they considered in what manner that expense could be lessened, and he had to state that measures would be taken with that view. In giving the pension to Sir A. Hart, to which he was entitled, Ministers contemplated a permanent reduction in the allowance of the Lord Chancellor from 10,000*l.*, which, considering all the circumstances of the case, appeared a greater sum than was necessary, to 8,000*l.* a year, so that the charge upon the public was 3,600*l.* a year for the life of an old man, while 2,000*l.* per annum would be saved in future in the salary of Lord Chancellor of Ireland. He threw himself upon the kind feelings of the House and the public to say whether, in this arrangement, he could be charged with inattention to the wants and necessities of the people, when everything connected with a wise and just economy had been regarded: and he had only rejected the bad economy involved in saving a small sum annually, and continuing the Irish Government on such a principle as might not meet all the exigencies of the times. With respect to some other arrangements connected with Ireland, which were not as yet fully completed, he did not pretend, individually, to possess much minute knowledge of the state of Ireland, but he had consulted with those who had enjoyed better opportunities of acquiring information on the subject. His great anxiety was, to fill up the vacant offices in a manner best calculated to promote the public service, at the same time preventing jealousies and discontent by the fairness of the appointments. He thought he had best consulted all these points in the course he had taken, and should be greatly disappointed indeed if the nominations excited disapprobation, when he expected the contrary, having nothing in view throughout but the efficiency of the public service and general harmony and satisfaction. There was another circumstance alluded to by his noble friend, which was one more of the rumours in relation to which Ministers had been questioned,—he referred to the noble Lord's allusion to the possibility of a noble person in that House receiving an appointment which would cause some reduction in the public expenditure. For that noble person he had a most unfeigned respect. There was no situation, however high, which he was not fit to fill; but (and here again he had to complain of being forced to reply to rumours), it was with regret that he was unable to confirm the statement which his noble friend had alluded to. His noble friend had stated, that accusations were made against him (Earl Grey) as if he had sanctioned improper appointments by the Government, with a view to promote the interests of his own kindred and connexions. In forming the Government, he had throughout, and in every instance, been influenced exclusively by considerations of the personal qualifications of individuals for office: in no case had he deviated from this rule. If he promoted persons, it was because he considered them fit for the places to which they were nominated, and from no other considerations whatsoever. The members of his own family who had received appointments were not many, and perhaps the first to be noticed was that of a noble Peer (Lord Durham), who by marriage had become a member of his family. In forming the Government, he had been guided, not merely by that noble Lord's abilities, but by the consistency of his opinions, and the excellence of his character. The office given to that noble Lord it could not be disputed that he was well qualified to fill. The next individual to whose appointment he would refer was, if possible, still more nearly related—his own son. He had certainly considered an official situation of that kind an honourable object of ambition for a young man;

and he had, by the kindness of his noble friend (Viscount Goderich), made him Under Secretary for the Colonies. He confessed he did look with pleasure to the opportunity of placing his son in a situation in which he might become acquainted with the business of Government, and perhaps qualify himself for the discharge of the duties of more important situations hereafter. He had been the more anxious to place him in that particular department, because it was one of the greatest importance, and because it was presided over by a person of such acknowledged skill and experience as his noble friend near him; but he should not have placed him in that or in any other department, if he had not been persuaded that he was possessed of diligence, and that he was in all respects qualified to discharge the duties of the situation with satisfaction to the public. He had therefore given this appointment to his son; but he had given it to him as he had given appointments to all others, and that, he hoped he need hardly assure their Lordships, was upon this understanding, and upon no other,—namely, that if he had not diligence, or was not qualified to discharge the duties of the situation with perfect satisfaction to the public, he should be removed instantly, and without a moment's hesitation. There were two or three others, more or less connected with him, who had been appointed to situations under the Crown. These he need not more particularly designate; but allow him to say, that he had no conception, when he accepted office, that it was necessary for him to surround himself with strangers, and carefully to exclude from office every person who might happen to be connected with him. That this would or ought to be expected from him, he repeated, he did not know; neither was he able to perceive the propriety of such expectations; but he could assure their Lordships upon his honour, that no one of the persons who had been alluded to would have been appointed to the situations they filled, unless he had been firmly convinced that they were all, not only qualified, but eminently qualified to fill those situations; and he would willingly submit to any censure that might be passed upon him there or elsewhere, if any one of them could be pointed out who was undeserving the character which he then pronounced upon them. It was rather too late for him to begin now to forfeit that character, such as it was, which it had hitherto been his pride and his glory to uphold, by giving away appointments from interested motives, or of affording reason to suppose, that in the discharge of the important duties that now devolved upon him, he could be actuated by any other desire than to supply the service of the State in the ablest and most efficient manner. Their Lordships would, he was sure, see that he had been forced to make these observations, and he did trust that the explanations, which the occasion had called for, would be considered satisfactory to their Lordships.

Lord *Farnham* said, that notwithstanding what had fallen from the noble Earl (Grey), his experience of Ireland justified him in saying, that political and judicial office, in the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, ought not to be united. The great advantage which resulted from the appointment of Sir Anthony Hart consisted in its being well known that he was in no degree connected with any political party. No one that he was now addressing could, any more than himself, entertain any doubt as to the eminent abilities and acquirements of Lord Plunkett; but then Lord Plunkett was considered to be opposed to the political views of certain persons in Ireland, and those persons were some of the most zealous friends of the British connexion. In the north of Ireland there was a large number of persons, who would at one time have shed the last drop of their blood in the maintenance of British connexions; but these persons were now fast approximating to the views of those who thought that the union between the two countries was prejudicial to Ireland. For his own part, every one, he was sure, must see that he was led, as well by his principles as by his interest, to consider the repeal of the Union as the most prejudicial measure for both countries. He should, therefore, oppose that project to the utmost of his power, and he thought he was not going too far when he said, he was sure that every respectable man in Ireland would use his most strenuous exertions to prevent the success of the project; but if the appointment of Lord Plunkett could by possibility make any converts to the friends of the repeal of the Union, he was justified in lamenting that such an appointment should have taken place.

Earl *Grey* perfectly concurred with the noble Lord who had just sat down, in the position that it was necessary for them to do every thing in their power in order to prevent, not the injurious, for that was too mild a word, but the destructive consequences which must result from the dissolution of the Union. The dissolution of the Union was nothing more nor less than the separation of the two countries; and so strongly did he feel upon the subject, and doubtless the feelings of their Lordships were as strong, that he had no hesitation in saying, that the most effectual means must be resorted to, in order to prevent the success of a project so fraught with dangerous and destructive consequences. This, too, appeared to be the opinion of the noble Lord himself; and if it were so, he must say, that he could not help regretting, that instead of strongly expressing that opinion, the noble Lord should have held language which was calculated to produce discontent among those who were not discontented, and to inflame still more those who were already heated. The noble Lord had warned him lest the present Administration should be considered as hostile to the Protestant interest in Ireland; but if the present Administration should be so considered in Ireland, it would obtain that reputation only by the most gross misrepresentation, or by the most erroneous judgment. He hoped their Lordships would bear it in their recollection, that he had stated, in the arrangements which had been made with regard to Ireland, what he had had chiefly in view was, to show to the people of Ireland that all the different interests in that country—at least, what were supposed to be different interests, but which were in truth only different opinions and different feelings—had been consulted. It was with this view, and also with the hope that these imaginary distinctions of interests in Ireland would be removed, that the arrangements alluded to had been made, and that Lord Plunkett had been placed in the difficult and delicate post of adviser to the Lord Lieutenant. In this view it was, that he supposed that the appointment of Lord Plunkett would have been generally approved; and he must say, that he did regret that any one who had expressed his dislike to a separation between the two countries, should have given the slightest encouragement to the opinion that Lord Plunkett was opposed to the Protestant interest of Ireland; and that he much more regretted that the appointment of Lord Plunkett should have been put forward—he would not say as a justification, but—as accounting for the spread of hostile feelings towards the union between the two countries. He wished to uphold the Protestant and the Catholic interest of Ireland; and he wished to uphold both for the happiness and the security of Ireland. The noble Lord, however, chiefly rested upon this position, —namely, that the Lord Chancellor of Ireland ought not to have political duties, and that the appointment of Sir Anthony Hart was a good appointment, because Sir Anthony Hart was not a politician. The noble Lord, however, seemed to have altogether lost sight of the peculiar circumstances under which Sir Anthony Hart was appointed. Sir Anthony Hart was appointed at a time when great excitement prevailed on the subject of the Catholic Question, and for that reason it was that Lord Plunkett, though best qualified to fill the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland, was set aside, in order that there might be no additional ground for exciting agitation on that subject. There was now, however, an end of that agitation; and the agitation which did at present exist in Ireland, would, in his opinion, be materially lessened, if not altogether put an end to, by the appointment of Lord Plunkett. At least this was the object which he had had in view in making the arrangement of which the noble Lord complained.

Viscount *Goderich* said, that the appointment of Sir Anthony Hart having originated with him, he might offer a few words in explanation of the motives which had induced him to name him for the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland. It arose exclusively from the view he took, or rather which Mr. Canning, his predecessor, had taken, of the extreme embarrassment of Ireland, by the non-settlement of the Catholic question. He felt that this mode of disposing of the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland would afford some chance of mitigating the evil of the system. He never dreamt of recommending such a course as a permanent principle, adherence to which would be attended with the greatest possible inconvenience. Thank God, the immediate cause of discontent had been removed, and such being the case, it seemed to him that the choice of Lord Plunkett was well advised; that he was well qualified for a situation of such responsibility and official confidence; and that, far from deserving any imputation, it was one of the wisest steps that could be taken, and would contribute more than anything else to pacify the agitation in Ireland, and prevent a measure which, as his noble friend had said, would not only be a separation, but a total destruction of the interests of Ireland.

The Earl of *Gosford* was convinced, that the present Administration, if they had a fair trial given them, would be found most favourable to the Protestant interest of Ireland. As an Irishman he felt it his duty to state this conviction, and to say, that he should give the present Administration all the support in his power, because, if they redeemed the pledges they had made, they would deserve support. He could not concur with the noble Lord (Farnham) in the opinion that the appointment of Lord Plunkett would be considered in Ireland as a manifestation of hostility or indifference, on the part of Government, to the Protestant interest of that country.

Earl *Grosvenor* said, that he had called for these explanations, in order that an authorized contradiction might be given to the false and malicious rumours which were so industriously circulated. The very satisfactory explanations, for such he was sure their Lordships would consider them, which the noble Earl had given, proved that it was not necessary that he should have communicated to the noble Earl the topics to which he intended to call the attention of the House.

Motion agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, Dec. 13.

MINUTES.] The Colonial Acts Validity Bill was read a third time and passed.

Writs. On the Motion of Mr. PLANTA, a new Writ was ordered to be issued for the election of a Member for the Borough of Lostwithiel, in the room of the right hon. VESEY FITZGERALD, who had accepted the Chiltern Hundreds.

Petitions presented. By Mr. H. DAVIS, from the Inhabitants of the parishes of All Saints, St. Werburgh, and St. Mary, Bristol, for a repeal of the Assessed Taxes. For the abolition of Slavery, by Lord LOWTHER, from Kendal and Appleby, in Westmoreland:—By Colonel CAVENDISH, from Derby, and another place:—By Mr. KENNEDY, from a place in Ayr:—By Mr. WM. DUNCOMBE, from Holmfirth, Yorkshire:—By Sir R. H. INGLIS, from Turvey, Bedford:—By Sir T. ACLAND, from several places in Devonshire:—By Mr. ELIOT, from Liskeard:—By Lord BRABAZON, from Carnew:—By Mr. BORRODALE, from Newcastle. By Lord LOWTHER, from the Land-owners of a parish in Westmoreland, for an amendment of the Tithe Laws. For the repeal of the Duties on Sea-borne Coals, by Mr. WALPOLE, from King's Lynn, Norfolk:—By Sir W. FOULKES, from Diss, in Norfolk:—By Mr. WM. DUNCOMBE, from Whidley:—By Sir THOS. ACLAND, from Torquay, and several other places in Devonshire.

[The hon. Baronet, in presenting these petitions, said, that he would, if the Ministers did not, make a motion for the repeal of the tax on the 8th of March.]

By Mr. ROBINSON, from two Electors of Liverpool, against the return of Mr. Ewart, on the grounds, as we understood, of bribery and corruption. For the extension of the Galway Franchise, by Sir F. BLAKE, from certain Merchants of Galway:—By Mr. LAMBERT, from certain Inhabitants of Galway. Against the Kildare-street Society, by Mr. FFRENCH, from Tibbereen. By Mr. LAMBERT, from Ballinasloe, Belvedere, and four other places. By the same hon. Member, from Belvedere, for the repeal of the Union.

BOROUGH OF EVESHAM ELECTION.] Mr. *E. B. Clive* reported, from the Evesham Election committee, that the sitting Members, Sir C. Cockerell and Archibald, Lord Kennedy, had not been duly elected, and that the petition against their return was neither frivolous nor vexatious. He further stated, that the Committee had come to the following Resolution, which he had been ordered to report to the House,—"That it is the opinion of this Committee, after hearing the evidence which has been laid before it, that Sir C. Cockerell, has, by his agent or agents, been guilty of bribery and corruption at the last election for the borough of Evesham, and that it is also the opinion of this Committee, that Archibald Kennedy, commonly called Lord Kennedy, has, by his agent or agents, been guilty of bribery and corruption at the same said election."

The Report ordered to lie on the Table.

Mr. Clive moved, that a new writ should be issued for the election of two burgesses to serve in the present Parliament for the borough of Evesham.

Mr. *A. Duncombe* said, that having been a member of that Committee, he thought it his duty to move, that the evidence which had been taken before it should be laid before the House. He was no friend to general reform; but he certainly thought that some proceedings should be taken in this instance, and he should therefore move to that effect.

The *Speaker* informed the hon. Member, that the motion for a new writ must be first disposed of, before the House could entertain such a motion.

The motion for the issuing of a new writ was accordingly put and agreed to.

Mr. Duncombe was then about to move

that the evidence should be laid before the House, when the Speaker interposed, and observed, that the House must, in the first instance, fix a day for taking the Report of the Committee into consideration. Accordingly, on the motion of Mr. Clive, the Report was ordered to be taken into further consideration on Thursday next.

Mr. A. Duncombe then moved, that the evidence taken before the Evesham Election committee should be laid before the House.

Mr. *Clive* said, that as Chairman of the committee, he felt it his duty to state, that the committee had come to a very proper resolution; at the same time, as we had now got an Administration which had determined to take the cause of reform into its own hands, he did not think that there would be any necessity for taking ulterior proceedings upon the evidence laid before the committee; and he trusted that the hon. Member would pause before he put the country to the expense of having it printed.

Lord *G. Lennox*, as a member of that committee, felt called upon to say, that though he was no reformer in the large way, he conceived that this being a case in which bribery and corruption had been undeniably proved, it was the duty of the House to look into it. He therefore trusted that his hon. friend would persevere in his motion, and that when the evidence was laid before the House, that hon. Members would read it. If it should appear from that evidence that the electors of Evesham had been bought at 12*l.* a head, it struck him that it would be a proper question for the consideration of the House whether they should be allowed to retain their franchise.

Motion agreed to.

Parliamentary Reform.] Mr. *Kennedy*, in rising to present Petitions from several parts of Scotland, praying for Reform in Parliament, took occasion to say, that nothing could be more unfounded than the assertion that had recently passed current, namely, that the people of Scotland were indifferent on the subject of Reform. The petitions which he had then to present most completely falsified that assertion. The first which he brought up was from the Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council of the Burgh of Ayr. The next was from the principal merchants and other inhabitants of Ayr; then followed petitions from the nine Incorporated Trades of that town; from Kirkcudbright; from the Merchants of the city of Edinburgh; all praying for Reform. All these petitions also prayed for Burgh Reform, and the hon. Member begged to assure the House that the desire for Reform was universal in Scotland.

They were severally laid upon the Table.

Truck-System.] Sir *R. Peel* said, he had three Petitions to present on a subject of very considerable importance. The first was from Walsall, the second from the manufacturing districts of Gloucestershire, and the third, which was signed by 14,000 persons, from Bolton; and the petitioners prayed the House to take the necessary steps for putting a stop to the practice which prevailed in those districts, and which was rapidly extending, of paying wages in goods instead of money. They objected to the system on three grounds—first, because it gave an advantage to the manufacturer who paid in goods over him who paid in money; secondly, because it injured the retail dealer; and thirdly, because it tended to degrade the working classes. If the Legislature suffered the system to continue, it could not refuse to allow the workman who received his wages in goods to pay rates and taxes in the same materials. The practice was also very disadvantageous to the poor man, as it precluded him from the power of saving any thing whatever. In the justice of the allegations of the petitions he perfectly concurred; and he certainly should support the measure which would shortly be introduced to the House to eradicate this evil.

Mr. *Cresset Pelham* believed, that much of the distress of the manufacturing districts arose from this system, and he should certainly support the motion of the hon. member for Staffordshire.

Sir *Horace St. Paul* said, that as a friend to the people, he also would support the measure of the hon. member for Staffordshire, for prohibiting the truck-system, to which, he was convinced, much of the distress of the working classes was to be attributed.

Mr. *Hume* was glad to find that the hon. Member had become the friend of the people. It was an extraordinary circumstance, for he believed that the hon.

Member had never given one vote to relieve the public from taxation, to which the distress of the country was mainly to be attributed. On the contrary, he had for twelve long years voted for every sort of extravagant expense which was proposed in that House. He denied that the truck-system had such a mischievous tendency as had been ascribed to it; and he was perfectly sure, that if the bill alluded to passed into a law, it would dry up one source of employment, and would add to the distress, instead of decreasing it. There could be no stronger proof that the truck-system did not cause the distress, than the fact, that distress and even disturbance existed to an alarming degree where the truck-system was not known; as for example, in Kent, Sussex and Essex. He was determined at all hazards to oppose the bill of the hon. Member as directly contrary to all the principles of free-trade, though he should not have made any observations at that time if the remarks of the right hon. Baronet had not tended to prejudge the question.

Sir *Horace St. Paul* complained of the personalities of the hon. member for Middlesex. He could tell him that his parliamentary conduct had been as conscientious and as upright as that of the hon. Member. The course which he pursued was, he believed, as useful to the people, and tended as much to improve their comforts, as that of the hon. Member.

Lord *Belgrave* hoped, that the master-manufacturers would themselves adopt a liberal system for the benefit of the people.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* expressed his concurrence in the sentiments of the right hon. Baronet; but he would not then enter into the subject, as it would be fully discussed to-morrow. If the Bill were inconsistent with the principles of free-trade, that was in his eyes a great recommendation, for free-trade was very injurious.

Mr. *Littleton* felt obliged to his right hon. friend for the observations he had made. His opinion would have great weight, because he was sure that he had not formed it rashly. He would not enter into the subject then, as it would be fully discussed to-morrow. The measure which he intended to introduce differed materially from that which he brought forward last year.

Mr. *Tennant* stated, that he was opposed to this injurious system of truck, but he was afraid that the hon. member for Staffordshire, in making a law to abolish it, would prevent the workman from the opportunity of making the best bargain for himself that he could. He earnestly hoped, however, that some remedy for the evil might be found.

Petitions to be printed.

THE NEW METROPOLITAN POLICE.] Sir *R. Peel* presented a Petition from St. John's, Hampstead, expressing approbation of the New Police, but praying that there might be some reduction of the expense. The right hon. Baronet also presented a Petition from the inhabitants of Deptford, which bore important testimony to the public advantage of the new police. It would be admitted that nothing could be more important than that property should receive sufficient protection in such a town as Deptford. The petitioners stated, that before the establishment of the new police, Deptford had no public watchmen. It had some watchmen paid by private individuals; and the petitioners stated, that during that time burglaries were committed almost nightly; but that since the new police had been established, there had been only two attempts at burglaries, in one of which the burglars were taken almost on the spot. One of the great objections urged to the present system was its great increase of expense; and on that part of the case he begged the House to suspend its judgment until the committee for which he should move after the recess should have had time to examine and make its report. The hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Hume), who from the station he held must be considered as a high authority on local matters relating to the county, had stated that in the parish of Poplar, the rate of watching had been raised under the new police from 1,450*l.* to 5,540*l.* The hon. Member was correct as to the figures, but it should be known that a great part of that increase arose from these circumstances—that the West India Docks and part of the East-India Docks were included in that parish—that those Docks paid for their own watching before the new police were established, but that since then they consented to be rated for the new police, the commissioners having undertaken the charge of watching them. This made the increase appear so great, and though in figures, as it was stated, there appeared this great increase on the whole parish, the fact was, that a very great portion of it is to be paid by the Docks. This showed the necessity of hearing both sides of a case before a decision was pronounced. He had no doubt that in other cases explanations equally satisfactory would be given when they came to be inquired into.

Mr. *Hume* said, that the petition from the parish in question had been presented by his hon. colleague. He had no disposition to exaggerate anything against the new police, for it was well known that he differed from those who objected to that system. In the statement he had made he only gave the information which was communicated to him by a deputation from the parish. He admitted that a committee would be the most effectual mode of deciding as to the real cause of the increase of expense.

Mr. *Wilks* said, that in one parish, with nearly 18,000 inhabitants, the addition of a rate of 8*d.* for the new police was found so oppressive that the collectors could not collect even the ordinary rates.

Sir *R. Peel* said, that a parish of such extent, and number of inhabitants, must have paid some rate for watching before, so that the whole rate of 8*d.* could not be an additional expense.

Petitions to lie on the Table.

West-India Colonies—Slavery.] The Marquis of *Chandos* said, he had been intrusted with a Petition from the West-India planters and others interested in property in the West Indies. The petition, he observed, was one of very considerable importance. The petitioners stated, that they had acquired their property in the West Indies under the sanction of the laws, the same as all other classes of his Majesty's subjects, and they very justly complained of the outcry which was raised against them, and the manner in which petitions were got up in London, and sent down to different parts of the country, on this subject. The petitioners prayed that the House, in any measures it might adopt on the subject of colonial slavery, would not act with injustice to themselves and their fellow-colonists, but that any measure to be adopted should be on the principle of the fullest compensation for any loss or depreciation of property it might occasion. The noble Lord observed that he was as favourable to the principle of the abolition of slavery as any man, but he would not listen to those clamours which were raised in favour of the abolition without any reference to the interests of those who might be affected by it. The condition of the colonists was one which called for relief. They had last year asked for some reduction, but had got much less than they were entitled to; but they still looked with confidence to large reductions in the duties on coffee, rum, and sugars, and he earnestly hoped, from the manly candour and sincerity of the noble Lord (Althorp), that the serious attention of Government would be called to this subject.

Mr. *Marryat* supported the prayer of the petition, and was understood to deprecate the manner in which the colonists had been attacked, and the inconsiderate demand which had been made for immediate abolition, without reference to the interests of those whose whole property it involved. He complained of the outcry that had been raised in the country against the West-Indian proprietors, and the attempt that there was, to force the House into a conclusion on the subject; in illustration of which, he mentioned a petition that had been presented from some congregation, by a noble Lord, on the 4th of November, which spoke of the impropriety of suffering traffickers in human flesh to hold a seat in that House, where they appeared like Satan seated among the sons of God, and which called on Parliament to grant no compensation to men that dealt in human blood. A crusade had, in fact, been preached in the names of Christianity and humanity, against what some gentlemen called the accursed horrors of the West-India Islands. They said, that the West-Indians were men who were the receivers of stolen property, knowing it to be stolen, and that viewing this, they could not help burning with a holy indignation. But these holy persons themselves were wishing to do what they decried—namely, rob others of their property; were preaching these doctrines at the risk of exciting insurrection, and were so determined against giving a fair hearing to one party, that they declared they could not give credit to any one who had been contaminated by breathing the air of a slave-colony. It was true that Christianity forbade slavery, but it was equally true that its doctrines forbade their letting loose a large slave-population, the inevitable consequence of which must be a general massacre. Besides which, he contended, that, without taking into consideration the impossibility of compensation, slavery, as it now existed in its mitigated form in the West Indies, was a much less evil than the risk which would follow any alteration. There always must be evil in the world, and he was afraid that the attempts to get rid of it by violence and suddenly, only confirmed its dominion and extended its sway. He hoped, therefore, the House would not take any step on this subject without well considering the condition of the colonist and also that of the slave-population; and whether that condition would be improved by immediate abolition. He was willing to go hand in hand with those who would improve the condition of the slave; but he deprecated any measure of violent interference.

Mr. *Briscoe* was convinced that the general question of Slave Emancipation must very soon be forced on the attention of his Majesty's Ministers, and it was desirable that such a question should be settled, not only by a vote of that House, but with the consent of the West-India proprietors, and under the sanction of his Majesty's Government. The petitions which he had seen against slavery rested their claims on the highest 'vantage ground; they designated slavery as a crime disgraceful to man, and they dwelt on the moral and mental degradation of the slave. These petitions had likewise additional weight by having affixed to them the signatures of clergymen of all denominations, who held that it was revolting to Christianity that it should be argued that slaves were private property, and therefore must not be meddled with. He had looked at the subject with much patient attention, and he was convinced that the time was come when the Parliament must take the matter in hand, and decide that the slave should be set free.

Mr. *Long Wellesley* said, that of all the questions which could come before the House, this was one of the most important. He concurred in much of what he had heard from the hon. Members on both sides of this subject, for he fully admitted the principle that slavery ought to be abolished, being fully impressed that it was directly opposed to the principles of Christianity; but he at the same time admitted, that in any measure which Parliament might be disposed to adopt with respect to the abolition of slavery, due regard should be had to the interests of the colonists, so as to give them full and entire compensation. He sincerely hoped, that the subject would engage the serious consideration of Government. After all he had heard on this subject, he was convinced that colonial slavery could not be abolished by a single vote of Parliament. Before that, it would be the duty of the House to enter into an inquiry into the whole of our colonial policy, as, in his opinion, it wanted revision. He wished to be distinctly understood as abating nothing of his hostility to slavery; but he thought the most effectual mode of bringing that desirable object about would be, an entire change in the system of our colonial policy.

Mr. *Keith Douglas* had one word to add to the observations which had been made by his noble friend, or he should not have otherwise thought it necessary to call the attention of the House and the Government to the subject. The petition presented by his noble friend was signed by gentlemen of great respectability—of as great respectability as any gentlemen in the House; and the great object of the petitioners was, to implore the House, if it granted emancipation, as that would destroy all slave property, to grant the West-India proprietors compensation. It further prayed, that the House would institute an inquiry into the whole state of society in the West Indies. Before the House did emancipate the slave, inquiry certainly would be necessary, by fair and competent judges, if it were only to ascertain what amount of compensation should be granted to his master. His Majesty's Ministers were probably not disposed to grant inquiry, as they were generally men who rested their claim to the confidence of the country by acting on this point in conformity to the sentiments of the people. He must, however, say, that he hoped from their general candour that they would not bow to the popular prejudices, that they would look at the question with coolness and impartiality, and that, aware of all its difficulties, they would treat it with a view of doing justice to all parties, and giving the country at large confidence in their decision. They would not listen, he was sure, only to the representations of the over-zealous partizans of either side, with whom the country was now inundated, and they would regard the question with the feelings of strict neutrality between the planters and the advocates of the abolition. Former Governments had done that, and had not hurried on the decision. They had not, however, taken on themselves as they ought, the responsibility of settling this question. They had not always stood neuter, but they had stood aloof, giving the discussions an air of a squabble between rival parties. Sometimes they had thrown themselves into the scale of the abolitionists, forgetting that they were bound to protect the property and trade of the West-India Islands. It was said of the West-India proprietors, that they had no feelings like other men, and that, if their slaves were emancipated, they could obtain free labour in the West Indies. This latter assertion, however, was disproved by experience. People who made that assertion did not consider what was the basis and compact of the West-Indian Society. It was that two or three white persons should rule over a great multitude of slaves. Those slaves were the only labourers on the estates, and the others were the proprietors. There were in that state of society no intervening links between the master and the slave, no connexions between these extreme points, such as were found in other communities. Those who urged forward emancipation, had but a very imperfect acquaintance, with the state of society in the West Indies, and their zeal would only excite irritation, and, if followed up, bring on the dissolution of society in those islands. Such conduct would not be beneficial to the islands, and he thought he did his duty by adhering to the laws of the country and to the present system of West-Indian society. If society there were to be dissolved, all property would be destroyed, industry would stop, all trade would be at an end, and all the shipping now engaged in it would be annihilated at once. How would humanity —how would justice be served by that? Would that benefit the African? He believed not. It would transfer our trade to other countries. The people here would not cease to use sugar, and to supply their consumption we should import largely from the Brazils and Cuba, where sugar was cultivated by slaves. Thus we should ruin our own possessions, annihilate the property of our own subjects, and transfer our trade in sugar to countries over which we had no control. He had carefully looked at the petitions which had been presented to the House, and of 2,600, the amount of them, 2,200 had proceeded from the Dissenters, sixty only from the Established Church of England and Scotland, and the remainder from the community at large. All these petitions proceeded on one principle—they declared, that man could not be the property of man, and therefore they demanded the immediate abolition of slavery. But these petitioners forgot that the compact of society there was different from what it was here, and that that compact, as it existed there, kept up the distinction between masters and slaves. He did not know by what original or natural right—by what else, in short, but by the compact of society, one man here was in possession of 150,000*l.* a year, while 2,000 or 3,000 labourers did not share as much amongst them. Some men here were in possession of large fortunes, while others laboured excessively for 5*s.* or 6*s.* a week. Was that, he would ask, natural and just? Was it more natural and more to be honoured, than that men were the property of men in the West Indies; or how could it be reconciled to reason except on the principle on which the West Indians defended their property—that it was the settled and organized form of society. What was it but the compact of society which gave the Duke of Devonshire a right to his property? Might not his servant say, in digging his garden, that he did it for himself, and not for him, and that the Duke had no right to the produce? In the West Indies the compact was different; and if the landed proprietor in England was bound to defer to the rights of the labourers, in the West Indies, the proprietor was bound to look after the welfare of his slaves, to make them comfortable and promote their improvement. The advocates of emancipation justified their demands on abstract rights, and on the principles of Christianity, but surely, if these were pushed to the extreme, they would not strengthen the right of property here, or would the state of society be found much more consistent with them in Europe than in the West Indies. He was far from wishing to advocate such extreme views, but neither did he desire to be their victim, and he cautioned gentlemen to be careful how they pushed their principles to the furthest point. What he thought should be done before emancipation was granted was, to inquire closely into the state of the colonies. For example, the Established Church of England was perhaps little suited to the colonies; and it would be wise to inquire if the Church of Scotland, as there were many persons belonging to that Church in the islands, might not be extended in them. Already some Commissioners had been sent to inquire into the state of Judicature in the Islands, and that inquiry ought to be pursued. The agitation of the question had already had considerable influence over the return of Members to that House, for, in many cases, it had been urged as a reason for opposing candidates, that they were connected with the West India interest. He wished for a Reform in Parliament to a certain extent; but he must aver, that a Reform would be most mischievous if it would prevent the Members from deliberating freely and fairly on the affairs of the country. In the present case, some of the Members were sent to Parliament pledged to vote for emancipation, and they had given those pledges to secure their election. If the influence of the people were to be carried to that extent, Reform would not be a blessing but a curse.

Lord *Morpeth* would not have said one word, if it had not been for some of the observations of the last hon. Members. Something had been said about "Swing;" but that gentleman's efforts were not to be justified by the exertions of the people of England to relieve the slaves. The slaves of the West Indies were the property of their masters; the labourers of England were the property of no man. The relations which took place in this country between landlord and labourer were the consequences of an unalterable state of society, and depended on principles that everywhere prevailed. The slavery in the West Indies was founded on an original wrong, which was yet unredressed, which was, in fact, in its consequences yet in full operation. It was founded in Acts of Parliament utterly repugnant to the sentiments of right and wrong implanted in the heart of man. The Bible said that there should be always poor in the land; but it nowhere said, that there should be always slaves. On the contrary, it gave reason to believe that slavery should be extinguished. He was aware, and had always said, that there was exaggeration on the side of the emancipationists; but exaggeration on their side was not more mischievous than concealment on the other. For his part, he wished for nothing more than that the question should be decided after impartial consideration.

Mr. *Macauley* said, if the petitioners who asked for compensation, and if the noble Marquis who presented the petition, and the hon. Member who spoke last but one, had confined themselves to the subject of compensation, he should not have thought it necessary to say one word on the subject. He thought—he believed the public also thought—that compensation ought to be given. He agreed with the noble Lord and the hon. Gentleman, and he agreed, too, with the petitioners, that whenever slavery was extinguished, all the loss of property which might arise should be made good by the Government. He agreed in this opinion, not because he agreed with what fell from the hon. member for Dumfries, which, by the by, he did not understand, about the compact of society. He did not see from that species of metaphysical argument how protection for property was necessary; but it was found by experience that it was bad for men that property should not be secured, and that great inconvenience resulted from violating property, and on that ground, it was said, that men ought to have their property protected. After the public had declared, by Acts of Parliament, that men should be property, after they had been bought and sold, deposited as pledges, and made to answer for dowers, great inconvenience would result from taking away that species of property, and the masters and owners ought to be compensated. He declared, that he thought, in common with most of those who petitioned the House, that slavery ought to be extinguished; but he and the petitioners all contemplated, on its extinction, giving a reasonable compensation to the masters of slaves. If, therefore, the noble Lord and the hon. Gentleman had confined themselves to compensation, which he admitted was just, he should not have said one word on the subject; but they had mingled other matters with that which he always wished to see separated from it. He agreed that exaggeration could not do any good, and he regretted, as much as the noble Lord and the hon. member for Dumfries, that either anger or exaggeration should have been displayed on either side. It was a charge against the petitions for the abolition, that they were all got up under the influence of the Anti-Slavery Society. The petitions were got up under that influence—was that extraordinary? Who should inform the people of England, busily employed in their own domestic occupations, of what occurred in the West Indies, if some such Society did not undertake the task? But the influence the Society possessed was over the public mind. It had no other. It appealed to the public reason. It had no monopoly of the public Press. Its reports and proceedings were open to cavil and objection. The periodical literature was as much in the hands of the West Indians as their opponents. Magazines and Reviews were on their side; of celebrated works, he believed that The Quarterly Review had always been in their favour. He did not believe that there was one of those periodical publications which were most read—he meant the newspapers—he did not believe that there was one of the London newspapers that was fully and completely on the side of the abolitionists. The organs of the West India body were as numerous as those of the other side, and their funds were at least equal to those of the Anti-Slavery society. It was not long ago that the West India body gave as much to one writer as the Anti-Slavery Society received and employed in a year. The fact was, that the West India body was in the wrong. All men were active to embrace the opposite opinions. They had been progressively gaining ground, and all the efforts of the West-Indians had failed to stem the tide of public opinion. They had been trying since 1802, and were carried further and further away every year from their object. The public feeling since that time had ebbed and flowed somewhat, but, on the whole, it had been much strengthened. After every ebb it had only run upwards with double vigour. It required that slavery should be abolished; it required, in the interest of the West-Indians themselves, as well as in the interest of the slaves, and in the interest of the country generally, that the question should be brought to a speedy conclusion, and that the slaves should be emancipated. The petitions, it was said, were violent; but, though nobody supposed violence was good, what good cause had escaped being disfigured by violence? The Christian religion itself at its origin was disfigured by many pious frauds, and fanatics then abounded. Such was the case, too, at the Reformation, and much violence was instrumental in bringing it to a conclusion. For his part, he did not charge the West-India body with the calumny that was uttered against the abolitionists. The body, he knew, contained many honourable men, who were free from all suspicion of such a charge, and who scouted as much as any honourable men could, those people who lived by slander and traded in violent abuse, and in whom the ideas of calumny and their dinner were inseparably associated. He would do justice to the West-Indians, and let them do justice to their opponents. Let neither party recriminate any longer. Let them all consider the matter like statesmen and legislators. Let them ask themselves, was there any evil, and was there a remedy for it? Were they the people who ought to apply the remedy, and was this the time? If this were the time, and they were the people, he would implore them to apply the remedy. He saw that there were many difficulties in the way of it; but he thought those difficulties would readily vanish if the subject were taken up by statesmen of a capacious intellect and resolute heart. The statesmen who had lately taken office were of that character: in them he had great confidence, and he had no doubt that they would bring forward the question in a proper manner. When it was brought forward, he, for one, wished that it should be with a view to extinguish the system of slavery; but he wished it brought forward carefully, with temperance, avoiding all causes of irritation, and all violence of language; he wished the question looked at as a whole, and that it should be discussed with a sincere desire to come to a calm and deliberate decision, and to do every interest justice.

Mr. *Bernal* complimented the last hon. Member on the tone and temper of his speech, and expressed a wish that every other discussion on the subject should be carrried on in the same calm and temperate manner. All parties wished, he believed, that calumny should be put down; at least, he was sure that the West Indians did. That was the language, also, of the petition presented to-night, which prayed that the Legislature would not interfere without inquiry. The West Indians courted inquiry. They had always done so; but if they had a bad cause, they would shun inquiry. The hon. Member who spoke last underrated, he believed, the difficulties of the task. There was the interest of this country to be considered—the interest of the West Indians—and there was also the interest of the negroes themselves; they could not be let loose like paupers. There was no Poor-law in the West Indies; and if the slaves were removed from the authority and control of their masters, whose interest and duty it was to make them comfortable, what would they do? The West Indians might complain of being much misrepresented in this country, where they were held up to odium as torturing their slaves. Nothing could be more untrue. The question had been in abeyance for several years, but was now revived. He did ample justice to the benevolent motives of the gentlemen he saw around him, but there was a good deal of exaggeration prevalent out of doors, which had been caused by a few over-zealous persons. In opposition to this statement, he would assure the House, that the West-India proprietors would readily co-operate with the Legislature in giving relief to the slave, and promoting his improvement by all possible means.

Mr. *Ewart* acquiesced in the sentiments which fell from his hon. and learned friend (Mr. Macauley). They did equal honour to his philosophical mind and to the strong love of truth and justice for which he was distinguished. He felt himself called on to say, that in the great town which he most unworthily, he was afraid, represented, the first wish of the great West-India merchants and proprietors was, that inquiry should be established, and that the truth should be displayed to the satisfaction of every man in the community. The next was, that if it were determined by the wisdom of the Legislature that an early emancipation should take place, then they wished that compensation should be given, and they looked on that as an inseparable condition. He and they both wished for gradual emancipation, as consistent with the great principle of liberty, and the proper care of the rights of property. He was convinced that gradual emancipation was alone consistent with sound policy and the principles of humanity. He would use on the subject the language of Virgil, as it had been applied by Mr. Pitt, in 1792, to the gradual civilization of Africa.

——"nos primus equis oriens afflavit anhelis,
Illìc sera rubens accendit lumina Vesper."

Mr. *Fowell Buxton* would not have troubled the House, but for some observations which had fallen from the former speakers. The hon. member for Liverpool, as well as the other hon. Members, wanted inquiry; but what would be the effect of inquiry; why interminable delay? If they were to institute inquiry—if they were to send out that roving Commission which had been spoken of, then to every proposition for meliorating the condition of the slave they would be told to stop till the Commission had reported—till the inquiry was completed; and they would stop till public feeling was cooled and deadened, and then they would stop for ever. It was a suspicious circumstance that inquiry was now demanded; and why was it not heretofore demanded? If, indeed, inquiry had begun ten years ago, at the instance of the West-Indians, there might now be some hope of reform. He formerly had proposed inquiry, and for that, much odium was thrown on him. The country was satisfied by the official documents already published. The business of the Government was, to put an end to slavery: that was what the country demanded, and it demanded that the abolition should be accomplished with the least possible injury to the West-Indian masters, and the greatest possible benefit to the slaves. He had heard it observed out of doors, that the question of compensation was now insisted upon, not merely for the sake of the compensation, but as an insuperable obstacle to the abolition. If the West-Indian body came to the House with that disposition; if the planters said, that the Government must pay them 140 millions sterling; if they made such a demand, it would be plain that they did not wish for compensation —they wished to prevent abolition. In the speculations which were made on this subject, there was one party entirely overlooked to whom compensation was due; the slaves were entitled to compensation. He admitted that if the planters were injured—he always had admitted—that they ought to be compensated by the British Government; but it was forgotten that the right claimed over the slave was founded in an abominable crime. The planters said, that if the slaves were to be emancipated they must be compensated; but if he approved of the planters being compensated, was he to give nothing to the slave? If he approved of the merchant being compensated for the loss of his trade, was he to give no compensation to that living merchandize which was made the object of this traffic? The only inquiry, he thought, which ought to be made, was an inquiry into the best and shortest way of putting an end to slavery. The question of compensation was always treated as between the British Government and the planter; but there was a third party. It was said, that the Government must give compensation to the planters, the guilty party; while the third party, the innocent and suffering party—the slaves—were to be entirely overlooked. It was most unjust, to say that the guilty party—that the planters, who would not do justice to their slaves—that they were to be relieved, while the slaves, the innocent and suffering party, were to be denied justice. He hoped that the question of compensation would be brought forward, but brought forward only when slavery was to be put an end to. He hoped that the question would be brought forward with a view that slavery might be extinguished peaceably; that was for the interest of the West-Indians themselves, and if that were not done they could not be saved from one wide-spread ruin.

Colonel *Sibthorp* observed, that the hon. Member opposed inquiry as useless, and said, that the people of England were satisfied; but would that be the case when the Chancellor of the Exchequer called on them to contribute a large tax to pay the compensation? He protested against the House and the country being led away by the statements published in the Anti-Slavery Society's Reports, of which not more than one word in every five thousand was worthy of belief. He was disposed to grant emancipation when they were fairly prepared to compensate the planters for their loss; but before they determined on taking such a course, he thought it would be right to ascertain from what source of taxation the amount of the compensation was to be drawn.

Sir *George Murray*: In consideration of what I owe to the office which I held under the late Government of his Majesty, as well as in consideration of what I owe to my own character, I trust the House will pardon me for offering a few observations on this subject, and in reply to one or two expressions which have fallen from hon. Members opposite. If I rightly understood the language of the hon. member for Dumfries (Mr. K. Douglas) he charges the late Government with not having displayed sufficient activity in its operations towards the accomplishment of the emancipation of the slaves in our West-India Colonies. Sir, I have always supposed, until this moment, that to abstain from any extraordinary activity in the measures to be carried into effect with respect to the Colonies was a merit rather than a defect; and that it was the duty of the Government, and the wish of the Legislature, that the Ministers should deprecate every course which would have the effect of calling the angry passions of the rival parties into play, or of exciting those premature expectations among the black population which they had so often heard described as likely to lead to calamitous consequences. My earnest endeavour, during the whole of the time it became my official duty to deal with the interests of the Colonies, was, to take what may be called a common-sense view of the subject. I endeavoured to abstain, as much as possible, from enlisting the powers of the Government on behalf of any of the parties who press this subject on the attention of the Legislature. I neither lent myself to those whose views seemed to be directed towards the accomplishment of their objects without any regard to the interests of others, and who sought only the gratification of their natural feelings—nor to those who would have gone blindly on, under the influence of passion and enthusiasm, excited by their sense of the condition of the slave—nor to those who took advantage of that enthusiasm to accomplish purposes purely interested, and who made it a theme for popular eloquence; but I laboured to consider it solely with reference to the great and unchangeable principles of justice and of real humanity. In the hands of the Government I always conceived it right that the execution of any measures of the Legislature should be left. Government was, in my opinion, situated in the most favourable position for carrying into effect those measures which were to pave the way for the entire abolition of slavery, (for, short of its total abolition, I never contemplated the possibility of stopping), and in its hands I endeavoured to preserve the execution of the wishes of the Legislature, because I felt that Government alone was capable of looking at the question, and carrying the resolutions of the people of this country into effect, with that degree of calmness, temperance, and impartiality which was requisite to ensure safety to all parties, and at the same time to render the black population itself capable of enjoying and appreciating the benefit which was to be bestowed on them. The hon. member for Dumfries has alluded to the peasantry of an English nobleman, in support of his argument, as if there could be any comparison between the man who enjoys the blessings of freedom and the slave; as if there could be any parallel drawn between the being who writhes under the lash of the driver, in hopeless and interminable bondage, and the freeman who, whatever may be the poverty or misery of his present condition, has it in his power, by industry, temperance, and good conduct, to raise himself, and, in point of fact, frequently does raise himself, in this land of liberty, to the highest station in the State, and to rank among the mightiest and wealthiest of its Peers. The hon. member for Dumfries seems also to intimate, that the system of judicature in the West Indies has been too much neglected by the late Government. It is very true, that all has not been done which was supposed necessary; but it is, unfortunately, not so easy to cast recommendations into the proper form as some persons imagine. I can say, however, with some confidence, that regulations for the improvement of the Judicature in the Colonies are now about to be established, under the orders of the late Government, in all the Colonies of the West Indies; and they have been already carried into effect in every colony under the immediate control of the Crown. The hon. Member has also referred to the state of the Church Establishment in the Colonies. I confess I did not feel myself called on to make any alteration on that subject. My object, during the time of my connection with the Colonies, was, to give full and complete liberty to all sects, and to curb as much as possible that spirit of intolerance which was unhappily too prevalent, and which was inconsistent with the laws of this country, and of the Colonies, and at variance with the liberal opinions of the age. With respect to the appointment of the Commission of Inquiry, I see no good it could possibly produce, except delay; and I believe the Parliament and the country require no delay except that which is justified by a sound judgment, prudence, and caution, which will so modify the extent and manner of interference as to prevent its producing evils more injurious than any which now exist. The question of compensation has been much insisted on in the course of this discussion. I think that nothing can be more proper, just, politic, and necessary, than that the planters of the West Indies should receive compensation for the loss they are likely to sustain by the emancipation of the negroes; but I confess I am at a loss to understand what good purpose is to be answered, even by giving compensation, if it is to be given with immediate emancipation. Immediate emancipation, such as some of the more enthusiastic in this country require, would, without those measures which are necessary to prepare the mind of the negro for the change, merely afford a sanction to the commission of murder, and an encouragement to the most dreadful scenes of plunder and devastation. Compensation I think the planters should receive; but if we grant immediate emancipation to those who are at this moment in the ignorance of bondage, and who are totally unprepared for the enjoyment of liberty, whether we pay their owners or do not pay them we shall most assuredly bring on confusion and disorder throughout the Colonies; give a license to rapine and licentiousness; rend asunder all the bonds of society, and make the estates of the planter a scene of ruin and desolation. I beg the House to excuse me for having said so much on this subject at the present moment; but I felt it necessary to trespass on its attention, in justification of the views I entertain on these questions, and in justification also of the views of that Government to which I had lately the honour to belong.

Mr. *K. Douglas* denied, that he meant to impute any blame to the right hon. Gentleman, or to the Government. He had only wished to assert, that the Government was bound to protect the property of the West-Indians. The right hon. Baronet had misunderstood his observations as to the slaves and labourers here. He had put that case hypothetically.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, it was impossible to overrate the enormous difficulties of the question presented to the House, or to avoid feeling how much danger there was in the discussion, and how much mischief might be produced by the use of hasty and unguarded expressions. He thought the House could not be too cautious in this respect, and he implored the Members to abstain from any language of recrimination or exaggeration, and from raising expectations in the minds of the black population of the Colonies which must prove eventually beyond their power to realise. What was at that moment passing in every part of the world must teach them the danger of tampering with such subjects, and he conjured them to take care that, while they were extending instruction, they did not also give expectations of speedy benefits which it would not be in their power to confer, and raise expectations of advantages which would prove wholly illusory. He was sorry to observe that the hon. member for Weymouth (Mr. F. Buxton) had made use of expressions totally at variance with those of the hon. and learned member for Calne (Mr. Macauley). The hon. Member had told them, that there was a third party, independent of the Government, and independent of the slave or of his master, whose interests and wishes must be consulted, and who had a right to be heard by the Legislature, and a claim on its attention, which could not be postponed. If, therefore, they were prepared to postpone the final settlement for a single day, the effects might be mischievous under such circumstances. Unless they were prepared to dissolve the traffic in this living merchandise on the instant—and who could say that they were?—he intreated them to be cautious of making use of expressions which could only irritate the passions, and might lead to incalculable mischief. Could any man, however, who listened to the speeches of the hon. member for Weymouth, close his eyes to the difficulties of the question? The hon. member for Calne admitted in the fullest manner that there must be compensation made to the planters. If their claim to compensation were admitted, what was to be its amount? Was the country to recompense the owner for the direct loss he would sustain in his slave, or from the consequential loss he must suffer in his property and plantations? These were grave and serious questions to be decided before they came to the point of emancipation; and then, supposing that eighty millions would be required for the purpose, were they prepared at once to demand that sum from the people of this country? Supposing, however, that emancipation was determined, and that compensation was to be granted, what security had they that the Colonies would not be involved, before they could carry it into effect, in a general conflagration? Did they consider the consequences of suddenly making such an alteration in the existing state of society? Could they, when the slave was emancipated, secure the control of the planter over him as a freeman? When the planter received compensation for his property, all desire to remain in the colony—all stimulus to watch over its interests would be taken away from him. The Aristocracy—if he might make use of such an expression—would leave the colony, having no inducement to remain. There would be no link by which society could be held together—there would be no Magistracy—no power by which wrong was to be punished, or right secured; and the Colonies would present a scene of civil war and a succession of barbarous conflicts, unmitigated by any of those checks which, in the civilized portion of the world, were found to soften the horrors of the fiercest party hostility. These were a portion of the evils which might flow from an indulgence of intemperance of expression, or from a too hasty compliance with the claims of the abolitionists. He only entreated them to pause until they could fairly approach the evils which they all ardently desired to see mitigated, but which never could be effectually dealt with unless they looked not more at the pecuniary rights of individuals, than at that which was of even much greater importance—the permanent welfare of the slave.

Lord *Althorp* fully agreed with the right hon. Baronet on the importance of the question, and the difficulties which attended its full consideration. While he agreed with the hon. Baronet and the other Members who had spoken on the subject, that the total emancipation of the slave should take place at the earliest possible period, he also agreed with them that every exertion should be made to render the negro worthy of the station to which he would be raised, and capable of appreciating the full benefits of emancipation. He thought it, therefore, of the utmost importance, that no means should be neglected to improve their morals, and to extend among them the advantages of education, so that they might become fit to receive with safety all the advantages of liberty. He was fully prepared to acknowledge, that the sudden emancipation of the slaves would be productive of great evils to the slaves themselves, and that the masters would not be able to preserve over them that control which was necessary for the preservation of the public tranquillity; but it was, therefore, the more necessary that the measures determined on by Parliament to improve the morals of the slave-population, and to better their condition, should be rigidly and generally enforced. He thought it necessary to say thus much, that the opinions of the Government on the question might not be misunderstood.

Mr. *O'Connell* contended strongly against granting compensation to the slave-owners, and deprecated the language used in the course of the debate. It was as much as to say, that the wrongs of the slaves should not be redressed, until the West Indians had received the price of human blood. One hon. Member had said, that nothing should be done until compensation was granted. Did not another Member say, that the treatment of the slave was as good as could be expected, and that his condition was comparatively happy, and he therefore deprecated all interference. He was surprised at the language which had been used throughout this debate, and, above all, at the observations respecting compensation. Good God! if the West-Indian slave-owner gave freedom to his slave, would he not still be enabled to procure his labour? The negro must procure food and lodging and clothing; and how was he to do this, but by his labour? No one ever proposed that the property, that the land, and the houses should be taken from the West-Indians. He was at a loss, therefore, to understand for what they were to receive compensation. The right hon. Baronet stated, that society in the West Indies would be dissolved; but how this was to be occasioned he was at a loss to understand. If the slaves were emancipated, the Courts of Justice would still continue—the law would still be in force—and security to property would still exist—how, therefore, this was to be brought about, he knew not. The only change that would take place would be, that the planter would have to employ the free labourer instead of the slave. The period was coming when this act of justice and humanity could no longer be delayed; and even now every proper feeling which could animate the heart, called upon the House to proceed in the consideration of the question. The time was come when it must be declared that slave-evidence should be received,—that females should not be subject to the lash,—that the slave should not depend upon the arbitrary will of a master; these were things which admitted not of delay; they must be considered; they must be decided upon; and a period must be fixed, after which every human being born in our colonies should be born free.

Sir *Robert Peel* protested against the consequences which must arise from the proposition of the hon. Gentleman. If a bill were brought down conferring immediate freedom upon those who should hereafter be born, what would be the feelings of those who now lived in slavery, and what would be the evil to the colonies? But he did not mean to deny that every effort ought to be made for the amelioration of the system. Slave-evidence ought undoubtedly to be received, he would not say for the benefit of the slaves, but for the interests of the country, as well as of humanity; some other amendments were equally called for.

The Petition to lie on the Table.

Reform.] At the request of Lord John Russell, who intimated a fear that it might excite premature and injurious discussion, Mr. D. W. Harvey postponed his Motion on the subject of the number of inhabitants in Boroughs and Corporate Towns.

Committee of Supply—Sinecures, Pensions, Salaries, &c. &c.] On the Motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply,

Mr. *Kennedy* begged to call the attention of the House to a circumstance in which the right hon. the member for Edinburgh was concerned. That right hon. Gentleman had promised to be present when this subject was brought forward, but, as he was not in attendance, he (Mr. Kennedy) felt it his duty to lay the matter before the House. He held in his hand a paper, which had been laid on the Table of that House, and from which it appeared that the right hon. Gentleman of whom he had spoken held the office of Lord

Clerk Registrar, and that of Keeper of the Signet, with a salary of 3,300*l.* attached. But it did not appear from that paper that he held another office, and that he derived from the place of Registrar of Sasines 3,000*l.* a year, so that altogether he had an income of 6,300*l.* a year. Now, if this flagrant error appeared in one item, what was to be thought of the general accuracy of the paper? He had been placed on the Committee for inquiring into the salaries enjoyed by Members of that House, and undoubtedly he should be prepared to do his duty on it, but he must say, he did not think that any effectual saving could be made in the department to which the examinations of that Committee were to be directed—namely, in the efficient branches of the public service. It was to the inefficient and sinecure branches that they must look for real beneficial economy. He wished to know how this very striking error had occurred. The paper to which he alluded ought to be amended, and referred to a Committee of that House to investigate its details. The country was certainly entitled to an abridgment of those salaries for which no service was done.

AMBASSADORS.] Colonel *Sibthorp* commented on the great expense of the Foreign Ambassadors, and begged to ask if it was true, that Lord Granville had been nominated to the Embassy of Paris, with all the former salary of 11,000*l.* a year attached to the post.

Lord *Palmerston* said, it was necessary that a change should take place in the Embassy; and Lord Granville was appointed. With regard to the salary of the Ambassadors, the late Government had revised that portion of the public expenditure, and the new Ambassador was going out at the reduced allowance; but if the House thought a further reduction should take place, the subject was open to consideration.

Mr. *Long Wellesley* said, that the English Ambassadors were not paid so high as foreign Ambassadors. He could state, from his own knowledge, that a relative of his own had spent a large portion of his private property in sustaining the becoming dignity of his appointment, and had not received a pension till after seventeen years' service. It was very well known that many others in the diplomatic service had employed their resources in a similar way. It ought also to be observed, that many persons had been placed in actual employment in order to save the country the expense of pensions for them, so that, on the whole, it could not be said that the Ambassadors were too highly paid.

Colonel *Sibthorp* said, that there was a pension of 2,000*l.* a year, in addition to the salary of 12,000*l.* paid to the Ambassador at the Court of Vienna; and no fewer than five pensions were paid to Ambassadors to the Ottoman Porte.

THE CURRENCY.] Mr. *Attwood* took that opportunity to ask the noble Lord (Althorp) whether it was the intention of the Government to propose any inquiry into the public distress, in connection with the change of the currency, or to adopt any measure of legislation to heal the wounds occasioned by the mischievous tampering with the currency by the Legislature since 1819.

Lord *Althorp* replied, that it was not the intention of his Majesty's Government to propose any inquiry into the expediency of altering the present plan of our currency. The hon. Gentleman would be perfectly right, with his view of the subject, to bring it forward for the consideration of Parliament; and whenever he did so, it was to be hoped that he would state explicitly what his object really was, and on what grounds he and his hon. friends were of opinion that the existing system of our currency could be advantageously altered: and whether it ought to be done by an increase of paper, by a restriction in the amount of cash payments, or by any new regulation with reference to the value of the metallic currency. For himself he would say, that, after having considered the subject long and attentively, he was perfectly satisfied that it would be utterly impossible to alter the value of our money, without producing an effect on the commerce of the country, that with reference not only to our exchanges with foreign countries, but to our domestic affairs, must be, in the highest degree, mischievous and destructive. It was of the utmost importance that the measure of value should remain fixed, and he, for one, therefore, would not consent to any further alteration in our monetary system.

Mr. *Attwood* expressed his regret to hear that it was not the intention of his Majesty's Government to bring the subject of the currency under the consideration of

Parliament, as he was convinced that to the state of that currency the severe distress which existed throughout the country was mainly attributable.

UNNECESSARY PLACES.] Mr. *Spence*, in order to shew the defective manner in which the returns already alluded to by the hon. member for Ayr (Mr. Kennedy), and the undue manner in which offices were accumulated in the persons of individuals, instanced the case of one person who held the situations of Prothonotary of the Court of Chancery, Clerk of the Hanaper, and Commissioner of Bankrupts; the emoluments of which several offices amounted to upwards of 9,700*l.* a year, and which were wholly omitted in the returns. The person who held those offices was also a clergyman, and he had a right of reversion in them. He derived the greater part of this large sum from fees collected from bankrupts and insolvents. Unless his Majesty's Government should think proper themselves to take this subject into consideration, he would, at some future period, call the particular attention of the House to it.

Mr. *Hume* was happy that the present conversation gave him an opportunity of stating, that not one month, but six months ago, he had submitted to his noble friend, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and to other hon. friends, the absolute necessity of a strict inquiry into the mode in which the public money was wasted in pensions, sinecures, and salaries. It was in vain to order returns to be made on this subject. Some subterfuge was always resorted to to defeat the objects in view. For instance, in answer to an order that was directed last year to the Hackney-coach Office, one gentleman admitted that he held four offices. He (Mr. Hume) happened, however, to know, that this gentleman held five offices; and the return was therefore sent back with a request that it might be amended. This, however, was refused, on the ground that there was no precedent for the required proceeding. This and other circumstances led him to the result, that it would be quite impossible to accomplish anything that would be satisfactory to the House and the public, in the way of preventing money from being fraudulently taken out of the pockets of the people, by any returns from the offices themselves; and that it was indispensable that every individual case should be made the subject of specific investigation. In many cases, where the emoluments were derived from fees, it was well known that only three-fourths of the salaries actually enjoyed were stated in the returns to Parliament. In others, where there were compound offices, the difficulty of getting at the facts was considerable. He was convinced that it was impossible to ascertain the real merits of the various cases except by the examination of a committee, of that House. He begged, therefore, to ask his noble friend, if he had any objection to appoint a committee for that purpose after the recess? If he had been present when the committee was lately appointed, of which committee his noble friend had done him the honour to name him a member, and which was to take into consideration a description of offices that he (Mr. Hume) would rather not meddle with, he would have taken the opportunity of recommending in preference the appointment of a committee to take into consideration the more extensive class of officers to which he had alluded. He would do away with the granting of all patent places. The pensions on the Civil List all expired on the demise of the Crown. They amounted to 150,000*l.*; and he trusted that they would not be renewed. The people demanded and expected some unequivocal retrenchment of this nature, from one end of the kingdom to the other. Sinecures ought to undergo the same rigid investigation. The time had arrived when the plea of their being vested rights, by which the consideration of the subject had hitherto been clogged, should be done away with. He hoped that his noble friend would himself be prepared to propose the appointment of a committee of inquiry, such as he (Mr. Hume) recommended. If not, he now gave notice, that on the first Thursday after the recess he would move for the appointment of a committee for that purpose. He repeated, however, that if his noble friend, and his Majesty's Government generally, were disposed to take up the subject, he would much rather the committee should be appointed by them. He hoped, at least, that they would go to the bottom of the evil; and not be again deluded, as they had hitherto been. The state of the country imperatively required that every point of our national expenditure should be most rigorously examined.

Lord *Althorp* observed, that his hon.

friend asked him, if he had any objection to the appointment of a committee to inquire into the subordinate offices of the Crown. He would ask his hon. friend in return, to allow his Majesty's Ministers time to make the necessary examinations into the subject, and to endeavour to get rid of all unnecessary offices; and then, when they had done all that appeared to them to be practicable and expedient, the subject might be referred to the further consideration of a committee of that House. The view which his Majesty's Government took of the subject was, that they were determined, whenever they had power to do so, to abolish offices which had no duty attached to them. As far as they had hitherto gone, they had proceeded on that principle. They had not appointed to any offices, held during pleasure, where there were no duties to be performed; they had abolished several such offices. "Thank God!" exclaimed the noble Lord, "the time at which this country could be governed by patronage is past." Wherever his Majesty's Government were satisfied that places were merely patronage, they would abolish them; but not when they found that to those places useful duties were attached.

Mr. *R. Gordon* expressed the great satisfaction with which he had heard his noble friend declare, that it was the intention of his Majesty's Government to abolish all offices to which there were no duties attached. He hoped it would be remembered, that the offices of the Lord Privy Seal and the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster came under that description. They were wholly useless. He agreed entirely in opinion with his hon. friend, the member for Middlesex, with reference to the pensions which terminated with the demise of the Crown. He was aware that it would be said, that they were equitable vested rights. But he maintained that, in the existing circumstances of the country, they should either be done away with, or considerably reduced. Let the House look at the Pension-list; let it observe how many persons, in consequence of various family connections, had been for years and years quartered upon the public. How often had his hon. friend the member for Middlesex, endeavoured to bring the subject under the consideration of the House. The Chancellor of the Exchequer of the time had always refused to submit the English Pension-list to investigation; although the Scotch and the Irish Pension-lists had been brought under consideration. The time had, however, arrived when the country would no longer be so treated; when the people demanded the utmost possible economy and retrenchment. And he must confess that, having on a recent occasion alluded to the legal appointments in Ireland, on which occasion the noble Lord had said, that when the proper time came, he should be able to state to the House such an economical arrangement as would be generally satisfactory, it was with great regret that he had heard elsewhere that it was proposed to give Sir Anthony Hart a retiring pension of 3,600*l.*; which was to be met by a permanent reduction of 2,000*l.* in the salary of the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland. He was quite sure that this, together with the other legal arrangements in Ireland, would give the greatest and most general dissatisfaction.

Sir *R. Bateson*, referring to the circumstance that the Duke of Northumberland had very patriotically resigned of his own accord 7,000*l.* of his salary as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, wished to ask the noble Lord, if it was the intention of his Majesty's Government that the salary of the present Lord Lieutenant should be taken at the same rate.

Lord *Althorp*, in reply to his hon. friend the member for Cricklade, who had taunted him with the remark, that the offices of Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Lord Privy Seal were useless, and should be abolished, observed, that with respect to the Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster, the House was aware that the revenues of that Duchy were never considered a part of the revenues of the country, and therefore could not, together with the officer by whom they were administered, be submitted to the consideration of the House. He did not think the House ought to call on his Majesty to surrender those revenues. His Majesty had sacrificed other sources of income to the public good; but he (Lord Althorp) did not see, that because his Majesty had done so, he should be called upon to sacrifice all those sources. With respect to the office of Lord Privy Seal, both in England and in Scotland, he could not admit that it was a useless office in either country. Nor could he admit, that in such a Government as ours, it was desirable to abolish an office which materially contributed to the dignity of the Crown. It was by no means useless to connect the higher orders of the nobility with the Crown, in such a manner as to maintain its proper state and splendour. This he said with respect to the offices, but the amount of the salaries attached to them was quite a different matter; and it would, of course, be competent to the committee which had been appointed for the purpose of investigating the subject, to consider whether or not those salaries ought to be reduced. As to the question which had been put to him by the hon. Baronet, with respect to the salary of the present Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, he believed that the same arrangements had been made as with the former Lord Lieutenant; he meant the same reduction had been made on the amount of the salary.

Sir *E. B. Sugden* admitted, that sinecure offices were a great burthen on the country. He maintained, that the individual who held the Great Seal ought to have an income sufficiently large to maintain his dignity; but that there was no defence for patent places. They were granted in many cases most unnecessarily, and frequently fell at remote periods, to persons by whom they ought not to be possessed; the means by which those persons were paid being taken from the suitors in Courts of Justice, and thereby injuring the administration of the law. It was entirely a different thing, however, with the great Officers of State; and it appeared to him to be a very wild notion to condemn the ancient office of the Lord Privy Seal —an office of considerable use. It was undoubtedly necessary that every Administration should have some places, or other means of liberality, to assist them in carrying on their Government. They could not always proceed upon the principles of the hon. member for Middlesex, and burthen a man to the last endurable point, with the least possible remuneration for his labour. Honest exertions in the public service ought to be fairly rewarded. He would not reward those who did not deserve it; but he would always reward those who did.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, he had never heard his hon. friend, the member for Middlesex, maintain that men who laboured for the public ought not to be paid for their labour. His hon. friend's argument had been, that those who did not labour ought not to receive any reward. With respect to the means which the hon. and learned Gentleman asserted ought to be at the disposal of Government to reward services, it should be recollected that those means were derived from the estates of insolvents and bankrupts. The Irish Pension-list was in the highest degree scandalous. There was not one individual upon it—with the exception of Lord Rodney—he meant the ancestor of the present Lord—who had ever done a particle of good to the country. There was still a representative of the great Rodney on that list; but at this remote period, he doubted whether even that was justifiable? There was the representative of Mr. Robert Shaw, a merchant and banker, whose son was a Baronet, and had been a Member of that House. Why was the country to be burthened with 800*l.* a-year for him? The Pension-lists ought to be referred to the consideration of a committee, to inquire on what services and on what alleged grounds the various pensions had been granted. If ever there was a person of integrity and honour, he was persuaded that it was the noble Lord; and he (Mr. O'Connell) had listened with great anxiety to hear the noble Lord's statement respecting the judicial appointments which had recently taken place in Ireland.

Lord *Althorp* observed, that he had not been able to make a satisfactory statement on that subject, because the whole arrangement had not been completed.

Mr. *O'Connell* proceeded:—The 10,000*l.* which had been the salary of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland was in Irish currency; being only 9,600*l.* British. The saving, therefore, would be only 1,600*l.* He begged to submit to the consideration of his Majesty's Government a case of supposition. If the administration of justice in Ireland were to be handed over to one family; if a system of nepotism were to prevail over the whole of that department of the State; if near relatives were to be so placed, that the appeal from their decisions must be from a relative here to a relative there; if (as he had remarked on another occasion) seats on the Bench were to be filled up by persons not known in the Courts, whom public opinion branded with incapacity, who were placed in high situations merely because they had been Members of that House; if a noble Lord were to be induced to resign on the score of age, for the purpose of replacing him by an individual of the same years; the consequences of such arrangements could not be contemplated without alarm. He by no means said that such appointments had taken place; but if they were to take place, the deepest blame would rest on his Majesty's Government. To the people of Ireland generally, but to the poorer classes especially, the defective administration of the law must be pregnant with the most injurious consequences. In promoting some of the individuals to whom he had adverted, Government would be promoting not their friends, but their enemies; and that he was an enemy was a very bad reason for advancing any one to a high judicial office. Were the things certain to which he had alluded as possible, no considerations of delicacy would prevent him from arraigning, if not impeaching, those by whom they had been done. He hoped that they would not be done without consulting the opinion of the Irish Bar. The opinions which he had expressed were not his alone—they were not the opinions of any party—they were universal Let his Majesty's Ministers consult the Irish Bench on the subject. Nothing in his whole political life had given him more pain than the necessity which he felt to make such observations with reference to any measure of a Government to which he was anxious to give his warm and disinterested support as the friends of economy and reform at home, and of peace abroad.

Mr. *George Robinson* recommended his Majesty's Ministers to repudiate all aid derived from corrupt sources, and to pursue steadily the course which they seemed to have marked out for themselves. They would then be supported by the country. He perfectly agreed with the noble Lord, that the time had gone by when any Administration could carry on the Government of the country unless they threw themselves on the people, and particularly on those Representatives who enjoyed the confidence of the people. Not long ago, an hon. Member asked the noble Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs a question with reference to the salary of the new Ambassador to France. The noble Lord's answer was, that of course that Ambassador would go out with the salary that had been fixed by the late Ministry. Now why that was a matter "of course," he (Mr. Robinson) was at a loss to understand; especially as he recollected, that when the Members of the present Government were on the other side of the House, they loudly protested against excessive diplomatic salaries. The question was, therefore, not what the late Ministers had fixed, but what the present Ministers, who professed so much love of retrenchment, would fix. On this subject he begged to say one word more. He did not wish to undervalue the merits of the distinguished persons who had at various periods served as Ambassadors from this country to foreign Courts. He had no doubt they were fully competent to the greater part of their duties. But this he would say, that no country in the world had ever been worse served by its Ambassadors, in all important matters which related to trade and commerce. They were inadequate to such discussions. They were either not well instructed, or they had been injudiciously selected. Wherever subjects of trade, or treaties of commerce, were discussed, our Ambassadors always appeared to be overmatched. He repeated his hope that he had misunderstood the noble Lord when he supposed him to say, that the new Ambassador to France would have the same salary as that which the late Ministry had fixed for his predecessor. He should be happy to support Ministers, but unquestionably he would oppose them with all his power if he found them not acting up to the principles they had professed out of office.

Lord *Palmerston* observed, that, in answer to the question which the hon. Gentleman had put to him on the subject, not long ago, he had stated, that the late Ministers had reduced the scale of the salaries of Ambassadors, and, therefore, that any new Ambassador would go out on the reduced salary of that scale. He had added, however, that the subject would still come under the revision of his Majesty's present Government. In the salary of the Ambassador to France the late Administration did not contemplate any reduction. No doubt, therefore, the present Ambassador to France would go with the present salary; with the understanding, however, that it would be subject to any reduction that might be considered proper. He was sorry to hear the hon. Gentleman assert, that England was the country the worst served by its Ambassadors; although he was glad to find that the assertion was qualified by limiting its application to matters of trade and commerce. If the allegation of the hon. Gentleman were well founded, it attached at least as much blame to the Government as to the Ambassadors of England; for it was well known that no Ambassador would negociate treaties of trade or commerce without having previously received the fullest instructions from home.

Sir *J. Yorke* was satisfied that if Ministers did their duty in the manner which they had declared they would, the most beneficial consequences would be the result. But he owned he was lamentably disappointed, after their assurances that they would never flinch, but would retrench to the back-bone, by the commencement which they had made. There was the noble Lord who had just been launched as Ambassador to France, to remain precisely at the same salary as his predecessor. If the noble Lord had stated that the offices of Lord Privy Seal, and Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster were abolished, or that those noble Lords who held them were to serve without pay, if he had stated that we were to have a Government without salaries, and a Civil List without pensions, it would have been something; but the new Ministers were already finding excuses for treading in the steps of their predecessors. If the Government adhered to a system of unflinching retrenchment and reform, they should have his support; but it would be a melancholy thing if, after all their fine professions, they were merely to tread in the steps of their predecessors. He expressed his exceeding astonishment that the members of the new Administration who had recorded their opinion to the effect that Ireland should, by the abolition of the office of Lord Lieutenant, be rendered an integral, and cease to be, as it were, a colonial portion of the British dominions, should not have come forward, now that they had the power, and declare that the office should exist no longer.

Mr. *H. Twiss* contended that it was a great mistake to suppose that the office of Lord Privy Seal was a needless office. With respect to pensions, he begged to say, that it was his hope the new Government would not be induced to place the Sovereign in the invidious position of creating an immense mass of private distress. Reduction, he insisted, ought to be confined to offices during pleasure. Those emoluments ought not to be taken away, which might be considered as vested interests. If the advocates of retrenchment and reform proceeded too far in their demands, they would entirely defeat their own object.

Mr. *Wilks* said, that he could not concur in the view of the last speaker, that pensions should be considered as vested interests. On the same profligate principle men were said to have a vested interest in slaves. With such answers to their demands the people of England would not be satisfied. They remembered that 113 Privy Councillors divided amongst themselves nearly a million of money, and that upwards of two millions were paid in salaries of 1,000*l.*, and they would not be satisfied by being told that these, and all the pensions on the Civil List, were vested interests. He trusted Government would not take the advice of the hon. and learned Gentleman. The glory of the present Administration would, he hoped, be founded on the promotion of reform and retrenchment.

Lord *Morpeth* was sure that his noble relative would cheerfully accede to any recommendation of that House respecting the salary he should receive for his services abroad. He observed, that it was unfair thus to assail the Government before it had time to draw the sword from the scabbard; and it ought not to be expected to cut down every abuse before it had had time even once to wield its arm.

Alderman *Waithman* was of opinion, that a salary of 11,000*l.* a-year was excessive for our Ambassador to France. The country would be shocked when they heard it was intended to send Lord Granville out with such an income. The sum was too large, and ought to be reduced instantly, for the extravagance of a profligate Government could be no excuse for any waste by a Government professing economy. He believed that the sum was far greater than the French Ambassador to this country enjoyed.

Mr. *R. Grant* had heard with some degree of anxiety the premature expression of distrust, upon the part of certain hon. Members, towards the Government. It appeared these hon. Members doubted whether the new Administration would act in accordance with the professions they had made. For himself he had no such doubt. He would have decidedly flinched from taking office if he had not received pledges that all their professions would be carried into effect; and amongst the rest, that an abolition should take place of all useless offices, and that there should be an adjustment of the salaries of offices which were to be maintained, in proportion to the services to be done. Now, although these reductions came under different heads, they yet fell under the same principle; for if there was to be an adjustment in proportion to the service rendered, it proved that, where there was no service there would be no salary, There was less hesitation and less time demanded when the object was to abolish useless offices, than when the office must be maintained, and the salary was to be adjusted. The latter was a matter of grave consideration; but at the same time he felt no doubt that, after due consideration, and at no very distant period, all salaries would be adjusted. It was too much to call on the Government, both to commence its inquiries, and at once to arrive at a decision. The main support of that Administration must arise from the fulfilment of these pledges, and from the assistance of the enlightened men who gave their voice to them in that House. They had nothing to depend upon but the friendship of the people, which would be afforded to them, not from blind confidence, but would be meted out to them in proportion to the services performed.

Mr. *Maberly* rose to declare, that the present Government should have his support as long as their conduct was in accordance with their professions. He had at present perfect confidence in the Administration, and he thought time should be allowed them. They should be afforded an opportunity of dealing with things, not abstractedly, but generally. He recommended classification in the work of reduction. They should not take a single office—it was useless and invidious; they should arrange a scale for the several salaries under the head of diplomacy, and go on with the Dead Weight, pensions, and other charges on the public revenue. The present Administration was the only one that ever professed to act upon the principles which were held by him (Mr. Maberly) and his friends. The determination that no reform should take place, although the Duke of Wellington only had the resolution to declare it, was, he believed, common to all the members of the late Government. He entreated hon. Members not to damage an Administration which was inclined to do right. That Administration was determined to practise economy, and a part of that economy would be a revision of our whole diplomatic expenditure. If, therefore, the old salary was at present continued to the Ambassador at Paris, it was only done till the whole could be arranged. The Administration was one which could not look for much support from the aristocracy. It must, in fact, depend upon the people; and in conclusion he would say to that Administration, if it were beaten on the great question of Reform in that House, let them at once dissolve Parliament—let them appeal to the people, and the people would give them a triumphant majority. This was his recommendation; and if they pursued it, they would be sure to secure themselves in the Government, and to retain the hearts of the people.

Mr. *Courtenay* declared, that the late Government had professed and pursued the principle of retrenchment; and remarked, that their reductions were not directed to the paltry salaries of clerks, but to those offices which had heretofore been filled up for the purposes of patronage. The Duke of Wellington, for instance, had not given away a single commission during the existence of the late Administration.

Lord *G. Bentinck* observed, in reference to the assertion of a worthy Alderman (Waithman), that the salary of 11,000*l.* a-year, granted to our Ambassador in France, was excessive—that the Ambassadors of the Citizen King and a reformed Chamber had 12,000*l.* a-year and a house.

Lord *John Russell* said, it was a gross error to suppose that the diplomatic expenditure of England exceeded that of other countries. He did not, however, mean to state that the salary alluded to should not be reduced; but the question required consideration. He declared, that although he had not recorded any vote upon the subject, in his opinion the keeping up the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland was not consistent with a just economy. But it did not follow, that because he entertained this opinion, he should approve of the removal of this officer in the present state of Ireland. It did not follow that Government, even if entertaining similar sentiments, was to say, "We will maintain our consistency—we will brave the danger—we will charge the

Secretary for the Home Department with the burthen of Irish affairs, notwithstanding the abundant occupation he receives from the present state of England ; we will take our chance for all the mischief which may arise from the removal of the Lord Lieutenant, rather than sacrifice one iota of our consistency." For his part he considered it would be much the better course to appoint a Lord Lieutenant for the present, looking forward to a time when, tranquillity being restored, and confidence re established in Ireland, they might safely and securely dispense with that part of the establishment. He admitted that in the last Administration there was more economy and less corruption than in any which had preceded it; it was far, however, from understanding the temper and necessities of the present times. Of the corruptions of Governments which had preceded the present they had damning proofs upon the Table. There were names in the pension list which ought to make those who bore them blush, and which had raised to the utmost the indignation of the people. There were sinecures created, not by the Duke of Wellington, but by those who had preceded him, which made it impossible not to see, either that the Government must reduce them in answer to the cry of the people, or else expose the faith of the country to stain. In conclusion he observed, that the mad resistance of the late Administration to Reform would not, had they continued in office, have defeated that measure, but would undoubtedly have involved the monarchy and the aristocracy in one common ruin.

Mr. *Lennard* declared his adhesion to the Ministers, but remarked, that if it wished to retain the confidence of the people, they must look upon the diplomatic expenditure with a scrutinising eye. He did not yet despair of them, and thought it was most unreasonable in others to find fault with them, for they had yet been only three weeks in office. He certainly hoped that the large perquisites of Diplomatic Offices would undergo revision.

Mr. *Hume* hoped, that the Government would suspend all the promotions of the year till it had fully ascertained how many were actually required. Every promotion was but an addition to the amount of the pensions of the country. There were now many more Officers, both in the naval and military establishments, than were actually wanted. He hoped that the Government would be prepared to stop them, from this day forward, till inquiry had been made. He gave them this caution, because he saw yesterday a notice of a promotion to an unattached commission. He believed that at this moment there were 1,200 Supernumerary Officers with all their half-pay. There might have been differences of opinion under the former Government as to the question of promotions, but after what had fallen from the noble Lord, he believed the rate of promotion formerly carried on would no longer be deemed necessary. Under the Government of the Duke of Wellington there had been more promotions, in a time of profound peace, than when we had a thousand pendants flying on the ocean, and 500,000 men in arms. If what the noble Lord had laid down should be followed, it would be well for the country, but if not, it would be the duty of some one to press the matter on the attention of the House.

Lord *Althorp* knew, that the subject referred to by the hon. Member had been under consideration, and that it was the desire of the Government to relieve the country as much as possible from the amount of the Dead Weight. He must say, however, that he did not agree with the hon. Member that all promotion whatever ought to stop. He acknowledged that it ought to be checked—that it should not go on without an absolute necessity—but to stop it altogether would be fatal to both Services, and to the Navy in particular. The great object, certainly, of the Government would be, to relieve, as much as possible, the nation from the expense of the Army and Navy.

Sir *G. Clerk* said, that as the hon. member for Middlesex had declared, that the promotions under the Administration of the Duke of Wellington had been greater than during the war, he thought it due to the character of that noble Duke to call the attention of the House to the regulations which the noble Duke had instituted to put a check upon promotion in the Navy, so that no promotion took place in any particular class till there were three vacancies in that class. That regulation had been at the time so much approved, even by the hon. member for Middlesex, that that hon. Member recommended to the noble Lord opposite (Lord Palmerston), then Secretary at War, that he should adopt a similar regulation in the Army. Although he had doubts of the extent of the economy which the Ministers would be able to practise, he certainly should be highly gratified to see them able to carry the system of retrenchment to the same extent as it had been carried under the Administration of the noble Duke. He was satisfied that very much indeed was expected from the present Ministers, and that some very extravagant ideas had gone abroad on the subject. He gave them full credit for their wish to meet those ideas; but he doubted their power to do so, and he believed that when they had had more time to look narrowly into the details of their various offices, they would see that it was much more difficult than they imagined to effect the reductions expected from them.

Mr. *Hobhouse* observed, that he and his hon. friends in the same situation with himself, were greatly embarrassed by having two Governments, the late and the present, to deal with. In his opinion it had been truly stated by the noble Lord, the Paymaster of the Forces, that the Duke of Wellington did not understand the feelings of the times, and did not go along with them as he ought in the belief of the necessity of the utmost economy and retrenchment. At the same time he was ready to confess that the late Ministers had gone as far as the corrupt system of that House, and of the Constitution of the Government allowed them. But with respect to going further, to their trying a new and constitutional mode of governing the country, that House had the best evidence to the contrary, in the declaration made by the noble Duke himself, who had told the House of Lords, and it was fortunate for that House, and for the country, that he had openly told them, he was determined not to try that new system which this country was now resolved, and the present Government determined, should be tried for the salvation of the community. He would not cavil at the opinion of that illustrious person, but he believed that the noble Duke was consistently the friend of the old, as he (Mr. Hobhouse) and his friends were of the new system. Under these circumstances, he could not but believe that the noble Lord was right in saying that the Duke of Wellington did not understand the circumstances of the times. Those circumstances were such, that no Ministers could now succeed without trying the new system: he defied them to do without it. He lived, perhaps, more amongst the people, for he was one of the people, than most other Members, and he knew their opinions. He was sure, that if Gentlemen saw the circumstances and signs of the times, as he saw them, they must be convinced that public opinion was running in a current which could not now be opposed by the present Government, and would never by any which might follow hereafter, be in the slightest degree controlled. He had no doubt that the present Ministers meant well—how could he doubt it?—He who had for so many years fought side by side with them—who had heard their oft-expressed opinions on the questions of reform and retrenchment—how could he believe that they were men who would at once betray and destroy their duty to the people and themselves? He had the best guarantee to the contrary—he had that of their own character—he had the knowledge of them privately, and he saw what was their course in their public duty. His confidence in them had rather increased during the last three weeks; he had heard from that bench language which he never expected to have heard from it—he meant the language of patriotism from men in office, who were men in whom he confided. They had not only not changed their opinion and their conduct, but had rather given greater pledges of the sincerity of their former opinions. They placed their dependence on the people, and they would not be disappointed; but he wished to guard them against the advice given them by the hon. and right hon. Members who sat on this (the Opposition) side of the House, having recently come over here from the opposite benches. By some of these hon. Members it had lately been said, that John Bull was a great gentleman, and of course must have servants like a great gentleman servants, in fact, who, like those of Don Quixote, would do what they pleased with their master. In that manner the great gentleman would be in a fair way to become a poor gentleman. He protested against the use of such language, and he assured the House, that the public felt most strongly they could not afford to play the great gentleman in that manner. So far from it, indeed, that the public did not like even their efficient officers to be overpaid. It was supposed that the public did not think the men overpaid who really did the business of the State—it was a mistake, there was a general—almost an universal feeling, that many of them were over-paid; and if the public wish were attended to, many of their salaries would be reduced; and it must be attended to, in order to keep public faith, and to support those necessary burthens which had placed the country in its present situation in Europe. He repeated his caution to his friends opposite, and he gave them this advice in a spirit of true friendship: for when he observed the hon. and right hon. Gentlemen newly arrived on that side of the House cheering the hon. Gentlemen opposite, he began, like a celebrated character of antiquity, to suspect that the latter had said some very foolish thing. He called on them, therefore, to depend on themselves, and on themselves alone: for he believed that they had both the will and the power to do real service to the country—he believed, indeed, as was said of them the other night, that they were placed between the country and destruction. He was happy to see that they were not opposed in a vexatious manner—a circumstance which did infinite credit to the right hon. Gentleman, late Secretary for the Home Department. No symptoms of faction had yet appeared in that House; he trusted it would be left to the other House of Parliament, or to any other place: but let them remember, that they were sent thither by the people, to do the work of the people, for the benefit of the people. While he had reason to think the Ministry held the same sentiments as those they formerly professed, and while they seemed to act on those sentiments, they should have his cordial support. He warned them, however, against the dangerous advice of the ex-under-Secretary, for if they wanted to secure the support of the people, they must not imitate his changing career, and they must cut off pensions as well as cut down salaries. Let the House recollect that they were sent there to do the work of the people, not countenance the bad jobs of any Ministers.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of SUPPLY.

Mr. *H. Twiss* said, he had been misunderstood on one point of advice which he had offered, and that was, in his recommendation of economy. He had suggested, certainly, that those pensions which had been irrevocably granted should not be reduced, but that offices which were held at the pleasure of Government should be curtailed. He was also mistaken by the hon. member for Westminster in having been understood to have proffered his friendship, or intimated his intention at any time to support the present Ministry. The hon. Gentleman had talked of the career he had run; but if the career of so unimportant an individual was worthy of the attention of the House, he challenged the hon. Member to state what there was so peculiar in his career as to justify the hon. Member in adverting to it in the terms he had done.

Mr. *W. Duncombe* rose to order. He submitted that the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Twiss) had delivered his sentiments once on the subject already during the evening, and that it was irregular for him again to address the House on the same subject.

Mr. *H. Twiss* submitted, that when a Member was attacked personally, the courtesy of the House properly permitted him to defend himself.

Mr. *Hobhouse* disclaimed any intention of saying anything offensive of the hon. and learned Gentleman. He never intended to insinuate that the hon. Member's career had not been honourable and consistent.

Mr. *Slaney* would not venture to intrude his sentiments upon the House, but that he felt his constituents were deeply interested. He understood the present Government was founded upon the principles of peace, retrenchment, and reform, and whilst Ministers acted in accordance with those principles, they should have his cordial support. He could assure the House that, amongst his constituents, and he believed throughout the country, there was a strong and increasing feeling in favour of reform.

Lord *Althorp* said, that perhaps the best mode of rendering himself intelligible would be, to state the supplies that had been voted for the present year, what were the Ways and Means which had been voted, and what remained to be voted. And first, as to the supplies voted.

The amount voted for the Army was	£7,414,000
For the Navy	5,597,000
For the Ordnance	1,695,000
And for the Miscellaneous	1,932,000
Total....	£16,638,000

To these were to be added 750,000*l.* Duty on Exchequer Bills, and 300,000*l.* on account of the Civil List; making in the whole a sum of 17,688,000*l.* The Ways and Means provided to meet this expenditure he stated as follows:—

Receipts from the East-India Company	£60,000
Surplus from supplies of last year	80,000
Sugar Duty	3,000,000
Repayment of Exchequer Bills	183,500
From the Consolidated Fund	12,500,000
	£15,823,000

There remained, therefore, 1,865,000*l.* to be voted. At present, however, he called upon the Committee to vote 1,850,000*l.* As to the amount of the supplies for the present year, he did not feel himself called upon to defend them. He now called upon the Committee merely to make up the deficiency that lay over since last Session. As to the supplies for the ensuing year, when they were brought forward, it would be the duty of the Committee to take the greatest possible care to reduce the Estimates to the lowest standard that was consistent with the public service. As to the intentions of his Majesty's Government, he knew that the expectations of the country were greatly excited; so greatly, that, with all the exertions that could be made, he feared some would be disappointed. He begged the House, however, to believe, that the Ministry would do their utmost to show that they were really in earnest in their professions of economy, and if the reductions they contemplated did not amount to as large a saving as some considered desirable, he hoped those who differed from him on that point, would nevertheless give him, and the other members of his Majesty's Government, credit for good intentions. The noble Lord concluded by moving a vote of 1,850,000*l.*

Mr. *R. Gordon* did not rise to oppose the motion of his noble friend, but merely to remind him of the peculiar situation in which the House was placed, with regard to the Estimates. The Estimates were for services performed from the 1st of January; they were never presented to the House until the end of February, and they were voted, perhaps, in June or July. What was called "the control of Parliament," therefore, was little more than a mockery, as the greater part of the money was spent before it was voted. In France the Estimates were voted a year in advance, and since 1825, when that system commenced, the representatives of the people in that country had a real and efficient control over the public money. He suggested to his noble friend, in the next Session, to bring forward the supplies for six quarters instead of four; and then the supplies for the various public services would really come under the control of Parliament. He had the greatest confidence in the plain, open conduct of his noble friend (the Chancellor of the Exchequer), who, he believed, was strictly an honest man. He heard his noble friend's determination, not to fill up inefficient offices, with great satisfaction; but still he felt that some offices had been filled up which were, in a great degree, inefficient. The office of Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, for instance, which the noble and learned Lord now on the Woolsack had so pointedly condemned; and the office of Post-master general, which had been recommended to be abolished in the reports of five committees, of one of which the noble Lord himself was Chairman. He took the opportunity of throwing out these observations, because he considered that the noble Lord was placed in a most enviable situation [*a laugh.*] He repeated the word enviable though it had excited a laugh, for his noble friend was placed in a situation in which he could do much good. He was now the Minister of the Crown; by his former conduct he had proved himself the friend of the people, and, by combining these two situations, he had it in his power to do incalculable service to the country. Let him not look to patronage or votes; let there be no hankering after boroughmongers, no soothing of one and tampering with another; let him say he depended on his acts, and he would be backed by the country. He had heard it said, that the Government kept great offices to give to the aristocracy, in order to obtain their support. He recommended the Government to sweep away those offices; not to seek for such influence, but to depend on the people. It was not in reference to the noble Lord's high blood, or the family he represented, but to his present situation and his principles, that he said his noble friend had it now in his power to earn a greater name than any one who had ever filled the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Colonel *Sibthorp* said, he intended to follow up the question he had put in the early part of the evening by sixty other questions respecting unnecessary offices. After the declaration of the noble Lord, however, he would not trouble the House by putting any other question at present. He was bound to confide in the noble Lord's declarations, and whilst the Government acted up to them, they should have his humble support.

Lord *Althorp* said, that if the hon. and gallant Member asked questions respecting all the useless places under Government, he might easily ask more than sixty questions. He could only assure the House, that the most rigid economy would continue to be enforced—that every office would be abolished that was not considered useful. He hoped that a very great saving might be effected in the collection of the Revenue, and he hoped, after the recess, to be able to come forward with some propositions on that subject which would show that the Government was in earnest. He never defended the keeping up any situation on the ground that it was desirable to obtain influence for the Crown in Parliament. He never used such an argument at the other side of the House, and certainly should not do so where he then stood. As to the office of the Great Seal in Scotland, it was almost the only office of state left in that country, and was settled by the Act of Union. He was glad, however, that the consideration of the emolument attached to it had been referred to a committee. As to the holder of the Privy Seal in England, he was a Cabinet Minister, and he could assure the House, that a member of the Cabinet, in these times, did not hold a sinecure. To abolish all those offices the Government must change the whole course of the law. He could state, however, from his own knowledge, that it was resolved that every office that was not useful should, as soon as possible, be abolished. The present Ministry had already abolished the office of Vice-treasurer of Ireland, of Postmaster-general of Ireland, and of Lieutenant-general of the Ordnance; and united the offices of Treasurer of the Navy and Vice-president of the Board of Trade. Reductions in several smaller offices had also been made; and seven or eight offices, not reported against by any committee, had been abolished. As to the office of Postmaster-general, he was aware that it had been reported against by a committee of that House, and that the duties were not of any great amount; but he believed that, when the details of the arrangements made by the noble Duke (Richmond) who now filled the office of Postmaster-general, came to be laid before Parliament, they would be found extremely satisfactory. His hon. friend (Mr. Gordon) had described his as an enviable situation; he felt his situation, however, as most alarming, and he confessed he was apprehensive that many of those with whom he had acted during his life, and who ought to give him credit, at least, for his good intentions would now desert him. He feared their desertion, he confessed, and, therefore, his situation was much more alarming than enviable.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* expressed his entire satisfaction at what had fallen from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. His situation was certainly most difficult, for great responsibility attached to it, as the distress of the country was urgent, and the country looked to the noble Lord and his colleagues for relief. He (Mr. Alderman Waithman) should feel it his duty to watch the proceedings of Government; but, as far as it was consistent with his duty, he would give the noble Lord his support.

Mr. *Hume* did not wish to go so far as France for an example of voting estimates in advance; at the same time, the estimates ought to be laid on the Table three months before the House was called on to vote them, in order that they might be fairly explained and considered. The noble Lord should be prepared now to lay before the House what was required for next year. The Ministers would surely be able to make all their reductions by the end of January. They might state within a few days what was the largest sum they would want for the next year. It was the large establishments that should be looked to, if any real savings were contemplated. There was 7,000,000*l.* for the Army, 6,000,000*l.* for the Navy, and 1,500,000*l.* for the Ordnance; and then the Artillery was five times the amount it had been a few years ago. In a state of profound peace, and with pacific intentions, why did the Government keep up a war establishment of 80,000 men, besides 29,000 men for the Navy? The Artillery was 9,000 at present; and 3,000 was formerly thought sufficient. It was not the pay of these men even, but the expenses of barracks, and the many other etceteras required for their convenience and efficiency, which swelled the amount of the estimates. He mentioned this particularly, because he heard it rumoured abroad that the Government intended adding to the military force of the country. He (Mr. Hume) trusted that it would not be deluded into any such step, and that the report was unfounded: so far from adding to the number, Government ought to reduce at least 20,000 men; and then it would have as large a force as existed in 1822. When 20,000 men might be reduced, it was throwing away millions, and priding themselves on saving a few thousands by the abolition of one or two offices. If 20,000 men were reduced immediately, the coal and candle duties might be repealed. The Navy might also safely be reduced to the extent of 10,000 men, including the 9,000 marines, not one-half of whom were ever afloat at the same time. If these reductions were made immediately, the whole of the Assessed taxes might be repealed, which pressed so heavily on the class the least able to bear them. He trusted the Chancellor of the Exchequer would now contradict the report that 6,000 or 7,000 additional troops were to be raised. The Government must prove itself in earnest in its professions of economy, if it did not wish to encounter a serious opposition. If palaces were to be repaired or built, let it be done out of the profits of the Crown-lands, and let not the people of England be called upon to pay for them by additional taxes. If the Government took advice from him as from a friend, he would tell the Lord Chancellor to enforce the same principles in the Cabinet as he did in his place in that House; and let the offices connected with the Duchy of Lancaster and the Duchy of Cornwall likewise be given up. The latter cost perhaps only 5,000*l.* a year, but it secured fifteen members in Parliament, and therefore he objected to it, not so much for the money as for the patronage and influence. In conclusion, he trusted that the Estimates for the next year would be produced at an early day, and that a large reduction would be found in the gross amount. That was the only way to relieve the distresses of the country.

Sir *Joseph Yorke* contended, that all extremes were bad, and declared that no extreme could be worse than that recommended by the hon. member for Middlesex—that of reducing the army below such an amount as was sufficient for the protection of the country and the maintenance of tranquillity. The most dangerous proposition that could be entertained would be that for reducing our military or naval force; and he sincerely trusted that he should never see the British Artillery in a worse state than it was at the present moment. Really, the policy recommended by the hon. Gentleman was no better than that which would kill the goose for the sake of its eggs. He must say, that he wished the hon. Member had remained in connexion with the North, and not sought to become the Representative of a large and rich county. He sincerely wished he might never see the time when he should lose the protection of the red-coats; but for the assistance which they rendered, he would take leave to say, that none of the leaders in the present disturbances would ever have been discovered. In his opinion, not a single soldier could be dispensed with; but he had no objection that the Government should throw the Dead Weight overboard as soon as ever it pleased.

Lord *Althorp* agreed with his hon. friend, the member for Middlesex, that it would be highly desirable not to vote the Estimates for so long a period as that recommended by the hon. member for Cricklade; and he further thought it would be highly desirable to have the Estimates laid before Parliament at as early a period as possible; but he must be allowed to say, that the worst possible economy would be to bring forward the Estimates prematurely, and before every possible reduction had been made which circumstances permitted. As to the question which had been asked by the hon. Gentleman, it was with regret he should give a reply to it, for he felt sorry to disappoint him; but truth compelled him to state, that the circumstances of the country had reduced his Majesty's Government to the necessity of making up their minds to propose the increase of the Army to the extent mentioned; that was, to the amount of 6,000 or 7,000 men; but he could at the same time assure the House, that every effort would be made to effect that addition in the cheapest manner possible. He was sure the House would concur with him in thinking, that at the present moment it was no matter of surprise that the Government should come forward with a proposition for the increase of the army. He was as averse as any man could be from desiring to govern by military force; but when riot and disorder every where prevailed, the first duty of the Government was to put it down. As to what had been said with respect to the Duchy of Lancaster, and as to the opinions expressed by his noble friend upon that subject, he begged to observe, that his noble friend had only spoken of the King's Speech as calculated to excite expectations which could not be realized. When it was intimated that his Majesty proposed to surrender all his hereditary revenues without reserve, it was looked for by his noble friend and was expected by the public that that declaration would include the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster, and that expectation, he feared, would not be fulfilled, and events proved that his anticipations were well founded. If by the words used expectations were raised which were not intended at all, surely those who never anticipated the excitement of such unfounded expectations were not to be accused of having pledged themselves to the fulfilment of such expectations. In defence of the continuance of the revenues of the Duchy remaining in the same state, he said that those revenues were one of the few remaining properties of the Crown which were at the disposal of his Majesty, and he hoped the House would permit him to say, that it would not be a gracious return to his present Majesty, after his having given up so much, to call on him for the relinquishment of that which all his predecessors had enjoyed.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* thought, the situation of the noble Lord undoubtedly one of great difficulty, and he regretted to hear demands from hon. Members which it was not in the power of his noble friend, nor of any other individual whatever, to comply with. He was extremely sorry to hear the hon. member for Middlesex—particularly under the present circumstances of the country,—again advocating that doctrine, which was one of the most mischievous that a human being could possibly advocate,—the reduction of our military establishments. He would ask the hon. member for Middlesex, if he looked to the state of France—of Belgium—of Holland,—if he considered the present state of Poland and of the kingdom of Naples,—and of all the neighbouring countries; could he think that these were times to reduce the miserable, scanty military force which we have at this instant. Did the hon. Member know, that in Ireland there were not above 300 cavalry?—and did he know that there were not above 100 in the northern districts, from Manchester to the borders of Scotland,—that there were not enough to perform the ordinary routine duties of the district? Would he, under these circumstances, reduce our army, and much less our navy? The Government had, in his opinion, very unwisely cut down our military establishments too low. Again, it was said, that the expenses of the country, at this moment, were very large, amounting to 50,000,000*l.* But the cutting down every establishment, the making every possible retrenchment, and the saving of every possible shilling, would not be sufficient, under our present circumstances, to give the country any effectual relief. Seventeen millions was the amount of our military and civil establishments, and our whole expenditure was about 50,000,000*l.* Under these circumstances, it was utterly impossible to make any reduction sufficient to satisfy the wishes and expectations of the people, unless some plan could be suggested to get rid of the 30,000,000*l.* a-year, appropriated to pay the interest of the debt. That was the bur then which pressed down the country,—which weighed so heavily on it; and while that remained, the House could not possibly effect a sufficient saving by the reduction of the establishments, to admit of such a diminution of taxation as would prove an essential benefit to the country. Suppose, as appears by the report of last year to be possible,—that a reduction in taxes, amounting to 1,000,000*l.* a-year could be made, would that be sufficient to alleviate the wants and meet the wishes of the people? He would not object to such a reduction, but he objected to hearing it said, that by reducing any part of the Army or Navy, we could make an important reduction in our taxation, which was impossible while 30,000,000*l.* annually was to be paid as interest on the public debt. He hoped, difficult as it was, that some plan might be devised to reduce that Debt. But he for one, would not sacrifice the respect he entertained for public justice for the sake of any temporary popularity to be obtained, by holding out hopes to the people, of a reduction of taxation which was quite impossible to the extent expected

Sir *Hussey Vivian* had heard with the utmost astonishment the observations which fell from the hon. member for Middlesex; and he had felt equal pleasure in listening to what fell from his noble friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The hon. member for Middlesex could not have considered the subject with his usual attention, and could know nothing of the real state of the country. He did not advocate the propriety of keeping up an army, in consequence of anything that had occurred in Poland, or the Netherlands, or in France, nor was he an advocate for keeping up a standing army in order to keep down and oppress the people of this country; to military government he had as great an objection as the hon. member for Middlesex; but for the purpose of preserving the peace, and securing the property of the country, a sufficient military force, in aid of the civil power, under existing circumstances, was absolutely necessary. There could not possibly be either peace or security in a kingdom where protection was not afforded to the persons and property of its inhabitants. We might boast of our liberty, but of what value was liberty without security? He had been for some time a resident in a disturbed part of the country, and had had an opportunity of observing it narrowly; he had taken some pains, by inquiring from the most intelligent and respectable persons of all classes, to endeavour to ascertain the cause of those disturbances, and he could not avoid saying, that he should have rejoiced had Ministers thought it desirable to inquire into them. They were most disgraceful and dangerous; they had carried fire and destruction into many parts of the country, and had separated and estranged the peasant from his natural and his real protector, the proprietor of the soil. When he said that he should have rejoiced at inquiry, he meant not the interminable inquiry which would have gone into all the various causes to which the changes had been attributed; but a tangible inquiry, which would have enabled the House to see how far they really originated in distress—what occasioned that distress—what difference existed in the wages in different parts of the country as compared with each other, and as compared with those of former years? Such an inquiry would have been beneficial, inasmuch as the information obtained might have enabled the House to apply a remedy, or at least to have formed a proper judgment in regard to the nature and origin of the disease. It had been generally stated, that the distress of the poorer classes was the cause of the disturbances. He admitted that that excuse might justly be made in some parts of England. Distress had undoubtedly been in some degree instrumental in giving rise to feelings hostile to the best interests of the country, and had driven the people—he would not say to despair—but had occasioned discontented and irritated feelings in the hearts of the lower classes of society. But while he admitted that distress had been in some places the cause of the disturbances, he could not allow it to have been the only, or even the principal cause; for, in truth, at the moment the riots broke out there was less distress than had previously existed, owing to the late good harvest. The truth was, the lower orders had been tampered with, excited to act as they had done—they had been taught to read, but had not been taught how to profit by education. In saying this, he wished not to be misunderstood. He did not object to the education of the people, for which he was as much an advocate as any gentleman in the House,—but the people had been trained to read, and in every little pothouse throughout the country, some of those inflammatory publications, that were so common and so numerous, were met with: and this he maintained, had been one great cause of the discontent which prevailed in the country. The poison had been administered, but the antidote had nowhere been provided—the people had been taught that the distress had arisen from the taxes, and the government had been assailed as the cause, not only out of doors, but even by Members of that House, but nowhere had the people been taught to understand, that if the Government were overturned to-morrow their distress would be ten times greater than it ever had been. He was convinced that what he stated was to be considered as one of the causes which had most materially assisted to break the links of that chain which had hitherto held the landlord and tenant, and the labourer together. What was it but discontent, which had been encouraged in the minds of the lower orders by violent inflammatory publications, which had severed this connexion? How was it that the peasantry no longer looked up to their landlords as their natural heads and protectors? Some persons attributed the disturbances to conspiracy, but they had not the characteristic marks of conspiracy. Like the cholera, spreading from the east over the fairest lands of the north, the contagion had passed the channel from revolutionary France, and from these had carried the disease, desire of change, through our once happy and contented people. He knew that in various parts of the country the landed proprietors and the clergy were pointed at, in common with the Government, as the oppressors of the lower classes, and he regretted to say, that in too many cases, even the middle classes had lent themselves to this false and shameful delusion; whilst in other parts of the country the farmers had come forward in the handsomest manner possible to lend their aid in putting down the disturbances; but the utmost injustice had been done to the landholders and clergymen of this country, who were condemned for keeping up the rents and the tithes, as if, even did they desire it, they had the power to augment them. It was not the landed proprietors who kept up the rents. It was not the seller, but the buyer who named the price. If any person had an estate in the market, and he was offered a certain price for it, it was not for him to say "I will take less—you shall have the estate for less than you offer." The landed proprietors were not in fault for there were few estates now let for which the landlords could not get the same rents were they again in the market. Such had been, and still was, the competition amongst the farmers. In this way the distress amongst the labourers was in some degree to be accounted for. The farmers were so desirous of becoming tenants, that they did in some cases, no doubt, agree to give rents beyond what the market-price of agricultural produce would perhaps justify, and in order to bring themselves home, they paid for labour less, perhaps, than they ought to do, and this they were enabled to effect, from the superabundant population to be found in most parts of the country. But the landed proprietors were not to blame for this, they found so many persons ready to give for their estates the rent at which they might be valued, that it was not to be expected that they should propose to receive less. He knew one case, in which a gentleman, a friend of his, offered all his tenants to take their farms off their hands, but not one of them would consent to the arrangement, and, at the same time, they refused to come forward and meet the difficulties of the times. In some instances the tenants had behaved admirably; but in others they had encouraged the lower orders to believe that their distresses arose from the high rate of rent and tithes, and had most unjustifiably called on the landlords and the clergy to come forward and reduce them, as if they were the oppressors of the labourer—thus holding them up to public indignation. He felt confident, that, if inquiry were made, it would be found that, in those parishes where there were resident gentry, less distress and fewer outrages had existed, than in those where the peasantry were immediately and exclusively under the control of the tenantry. For this reason, among others, he wished that a Committee of the House should have been appointed to inquire into the causes of the outrages. With respect to tithes, although he regretted as much as any man this system of paying the clergy, for it oftentimes placed in collision the parties of all others that ought to be on the best of terms—the pastor and his flock; and, moreover, it was an impediment to improvement; yet it must be admitted that the tithes were as much the property of the clergy as the land was of the proprietor; and when a man bought or rented an estate, he knowingly did it subject to the payment of tithes. But the truth was, the clergy in general did not get by any means that to which they were entitled. Nor could tithes justly be considered as bearing on the price of agricultural labour; for, if they did, how happened it that, in those parts where estates were tithe free, the labourers were paid the same rate of wages as in those where estates were subject to tithes? However, be the cause of distress what it might, he most unreservedly asserted, that the country required the utmost attention on the part of both landlords and tenants, in order that it might be restored to tranquillity; and on that account he rejoiced that the House was so soon to separate, being convinced that at that moment the residence of country gentlemen on their properties was of the utmost consequence, and might be of the greatest advantage. He was no alarmist, nor did he wish to create alarm in the minds of others; on the contrary, he would impart that conviction which he felt, that there was still a good spirit in the country, which would eventually enable us to overcome our difficulties; but it was impossible to conceal that they were very great,—and in order to surmount them, great exertions would be necessary on the part of the landed proprietors, and of the Government; the hands of which should be strengthened, by suppressing, for the time at least, all party feelings, or that desirable result could not be attained. The remedy for all the distress was comprised in one word, "employment." If any possible means could be devised which would ensure employment to the lower classes, it would be the means of restoring tranquillity to the country. How that employment was to be obtained, was the question. For his part, he would rather see some great national undertaking, such as railroads from one end of England to the other; he would rather see palaces built, he would, as had been before said, rather see holes dug and filled up again, than that any of the labouring classes should remain unemployed; but, without resorting to such measures, surely some means of employment equally beneficial to all parties might be discovered. It always had appeared to him an astonishing inconsistency, that there should be unemployed hands, and unoccupied lands. He might be told that these lands would not pay for bringing into cultivation—calculating like merchants, this, perhaps, was true; but if apportioned in small lots, they would give both food and employment to the poor. He was convinced, that as long as they remained in a state of idleness, the country never could return to that state of repose which was so ardently to be desired, and so necessary to its happiness. He had been induced to say thus much, because then, unfortunately, the real state of the country was not known to the House; at all events, it could not be known to the hon. member for Middlesex, when he proposed a reduction of 20,000 men from an army already too weak to ensure that security and protection in person and property which every man had a right to expect under a well-regulated Government.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* was not surprised at the observations made by the hon. Baronet, the member for Newcastle. For a long series of years the hon. Baronet had always supported the necessity of keeping up the military establishments of the country; and he was, therefore, not at all astonished that on the present occasion he had pursued the same course. He had never feared the consequences of our foreign relations, and at the present moment they appeared to require a smaller military establishment than at any previous time. We had formed, on principle, an alliance with France, and it was impossible to suppose that anything could happen to disturb that alliance. The hon. Baronet talked rather strangely about Poland, and Naples, and other continental States. This year, too, we had heard a vast deal about the state of our colonies; and hon. Members had asked, "What are we to do with them? You must keep up a standing army to preserve them." And then they talked about the direful state of the country. But if the hon. Baronet could prevail on Government —no doubt his opinions would have great weight on the subject—if the hon. Member could prevail on his Majesty's Ministers to consider how far this distress could be mitigated, such mitigation would prevent the necessity of resorting to any other measures. The noble Lord was, in his opinion, quite correct in stating that the argument of the noble personage, who now sat on the Woolsack, was addressed to the King's Speech, because the words of the Speech were, that his Majesty placed at the discretion of Parliament all his hereditary revenues without reserve; and the noble Lord argued that those words included the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster—at least, so he understood that noble individual. What fell from the noble Lord the other night would have more effect in quelling the disturbances than any military force that could be raised; nor could he help thinking that if the provisions of the bill, usually called Peel's Bill, could be mitigated, that it would relieve the distresses of the people in a great degree. He did not, in speaking of the manner in which the Estimates were produced, propose that the House should go on the system of voting one year in advance, but he suggested that it would be advantageous, on the 1st of July, to move for three-fourths of the ensuing year.

Mr. *Attwood* observed, that the hon. and gallant Officer, and the hon. Baronet had said, that the increase of the Army was necessary in consequence of the insubordination manifested in foreign nations. But, when he heard from the hon. member for Newcastle, that a reduction of taxation on so small a scale as to be of no real importance, is all that the country could expect, he could not but beg the noble Lord to consider what object he could hope to attain by any such retrenchment. If the benefit given to the country by retrenchment be met by increased expenses, by adding to the military establishment of the country, was it not the grossest delusion on the part of his Majesty's Government to hold out any expectation of relief, which they said they could not give without endangering the public safety? In the fifteenth year of peace, the House was called upon to increase the standing army of the country. For what purpose? Was it to enable the Government to make head against the people? or to enable a course of inquiry to be pursued which had been neglected by the Government—a course of inquiry which the noble Lord himself would hardly undertake to say, in his place in the House, he did not think to be materially connected with the interests of the country? Neither the noble Lord, nor any one of his colleagues would deny that an inquiry into the effect of the alterations in the value of money was most intimately and immediately connected with the state of danger and difficulty in which the country was placed. He could but regret that his Majesty's Ministers should pursue their present course. He would tell the noble Lord, that it could be proved to demonstration that the unfortunate measure of the alteration in the currency was at the bottom of all our present distress. He did not think that his Majesty's Ministers could make any improvement in the state of the country by retrenchment. When the noble Lord returned an answer to the question he had recently put, if his Majesty's Ministers meant to institute an inquiry, intimately connected with the most essential interests of the country—when he put that question he was accused of being deficient in precision. But it was not his object to shew that the course to which he had referred was intimately and essentially connected with the difficulties of the country; he only wished Ministers to point out the course of proceeding by which they meant to relieve the distress. He regretted to have received such an answer. If an inquiry were instituted into the fact, he was convinced that it would be found capable of being proved to demonstration, that the distress was wholly, or if not altogether, at least in a great measure, to be attributed to the change in the standard of the currency. It certainly would be competent to his Majesty's Ministers to institute an inquiry into the subject, nor ought they to consider the difficulty attendant on such a course as any excuse for not doing so. He was aware that there was great difficulty; but that was no reason why it should not be persevered in. Looking to the state in which the country was placed,—looking to the universal pauperism which existed,—the condition of the agricultural districts, and the poverty of the Exchequer of the country—he did not think that a proper time to move for an increase of the army.

Lord *Althorp* admitted, that it had been stated to be the opinion of the Government that the distress was only to be relieved by reform and retrenchment. But, upon looking into the financial condition of the country, he believed that, by altering in some instances the pressure of taxation, and in others by increasing the ultimate amount of the Revenue—not by increasing, but by diminishing the taxes, the Ministers would be able to effect a very considerable relief of the distress. Upon comparing the state of the country at different periods with its present state, and the amount of taxation at these periods with its present amount, he was convinced that the taxation was by no means of such an amount, or of such a nature, as not to afford a reasonable prospect of relieving the distress by retrenchment, and by an alteration of the pressure of the taxes. It had been said, that Sir R. Peel's bill had been a cause of the distress—he would not deny that it had had some such effect; but it was necessary to look to the consequences which would now follow from any change of that measure. What would be the result if this great commercial country were left without any fixed standard of value? To what had all the mischief now felt been originally owing, but to the depreciation of the standard of value, and to repeated tamperings with the currency? At the time when that depreciation took place, there was no intention to reduce the currency. But to do so advisedly, was the declared intention of the hon. Gentleman. But such a proposition had never been carried into effect in any country without producing the most disastrous consequences. It was a measure to which his Majesty's Ministers would never accede. They would endeavour by all possible means (as they had explained) to relieve the distress; but should they fail to effect that, he (Lord Althorp) would not be the man to recommend that House to tamper with the currency.

An *hon. Member* (who stood under the Gallery, and whose name we could not ascertain) thought, that Ministers would be authorised in calling for a still further increase of the Army. He agreed with an hon. Member who had said, that the proposed increase would not be sufficient. But he was convinced that any fresh change of the currency would lead to anarchy, which the advisers of a depreciation would deplore too late. He knew that the noble Lord opposite (Lord Althorp) stood in a situation of particular difficulty; but he gave him credit for sincerity of intention. He wished, however, to put a question, which he hoped would not be considered out of order. He did not expect a satisfactory answer, and he would put the question solely for the purpose of suggesting to the noble Lord an arrangement which would embrace both retrenchment and reform; for which latter, on moderate principles, he was an advocate. He begged leave to ask the noble Lord, whether it was intended to adopt a measure which had often been recommended, and which would do more for the country than even reform, he meant the total separation of the political from the judicial functions of the Lord Chancellor?

Mr. *Attwood* considered that the noble Lord (Althorp) trifled with his own understanding, when he allowed himself to believe that the Administration would be able to relieve the distresses effectually by any measures of retrenchment. When the noble Lord spoke of the evils which would result from another change in the currency, he omitted to look at the other side of the question. He did not consider the evils that would result from leaving it in its present state.

Mr. *Briscoe* said, that he, for one, regretted to hear of an increase of the Army, for he had expected a reduction; yet he still more regretted to hear, that the increase was necessary to keep his Majesty's subjects in submission to the Government. He understood from the noble Lord, that the present Administration would act on the principle which the circumstances of the times require—that is, be governed by the public opinion; and in that principle he had supposed the difference between them and their predecessors to consist. But he almost feared that their greatest difficulties would arise from their mistaking the temper of the times. The county which he had the honour to represent was restored to tranquillity. It had been recently disturbed; but it was restored to peace by means of the constitutional force of the country—the constabulary. He was pleased that he could yield the Administration his support upon the principles which they professed, but he felt bound to protest against the present proceeding. On the part of his constituents, he would not consent to the application of this money to the increase of the army.

> "Non tali auxilia nec defensoribus istis
> Tempus eget."

If the present constabulary force was insufficient, it ought to be increased, and public tranquillity maintained by the force which the Constitution recognised.

O'Gorman Mahon had not expected to hear, from an English county Member, such observations as had fallen from the hon. Member who had just sat down. He regretted to hear from that hon. Gentleman what was so much calculated to diminish the confidence of the people in that House. The tendency of the hon. Gentleman's speech was to intimate that the Ministers had neglected their pledges, and that those who supported them in that House forfeited the public confidence. The House had heard, no doubt, with great satisfaction, that the county which the hon. Gentleman represented was restored to tranquillity. But he would ask, did it appear that all the other counties of the kingdom would be tranquillised by the constabulary? Were not some of these counties in a state approaching to insurrection, despite of the civil force? More than fifty Members of that House had obtained leave to go into their respective districts on account of the failure of that force to maintain order. When applications had been made to that House to send bayonets to the people of his unfortunate country—when they asked for food, and received pills of lead—when they wanted the miserable potatoes with which they had been satisfied, nothing was then said against the increase of the army by the hon. member for Surrey. In the present state of this country, it was not a departure from economy, but the contrary, to add 6,000 men to the army. But the hon. member for Middlesex recommended, that, instead of adding 6,000 soldiers, they should reduce 20,000. What! in a time of distress, immediately occasioned by the want of employment, did he think it either good economy or wise policy to throw such a number of men from the state of competence which the army affords them, discontented and destitute upon the country? Was it expedient to place such a number of men, accustomed to the use of arms, and skilled in military discipline, in the same distress which had produced the outrages now disgracing so many parts of the country? The increase of troops had been required, not, as had been said, to put down the people, but to suppress disorder and to protect property. The means which the hon. member for Middlesex had recommended for the protection of property reminded him, (O'Gorman Mahon) of a story which he had read in his horn-book when he was a boy, respecting the town threatened with a siege. When the people deliberated as to the best means of defence, the currier recommended leather, and the carpenter wood. The hon. Gentleman proposed economy as the best means of defence against outrage, and offered to allay discontent by swelling the numbers of the discontented with 20,000 additional sufferers. He thought it not just to turn round upon such grounds, and bring a charge of breach of promise against men who were in the infancy of their Administration. He was satisfied that they would act according to their professions, and Gentlemen, by allowing them a fair trial, would, he was sure, promote the tranquillity, not only of England, but of Ireland and Scotland also.

Mr. *Denison* said, he was glad to hear from his noble friend before him, that it was not the intention of Government to consent to a change in the currency. Such a measure might produce some temporary prosperity, but it would terminate in ruin. He lived nearer than his hon. colleague to the disturbed part of the county which he had the honour to represent, and he could assure him, that the constabulary force had not been sufficient to restore tranquillity. The prisoners could not have been conveyed to jail without the aid of the military. The first thing which the state of the country required was, that the present turbulence should be put down; the next thing must be to consider the case of the labouring part of the population. He was convinced that the labourers had for some time been inadequately paid, but he believed that a reduction of taxation would enable the farmers to give sufficient wages. He rejoiced in the pledges which had been given by his Majesty's present Ministers, and especially with respect to a reform of that House, which he considered the most important question of the present period. He was confident that they would redeem their pledges, and act upon their professions. If they did so, they should have all the support he could give them.

Mr. *Briscoe* said, that what had fallen from his hon. colleague only served to confirm his opinion, that an increase of the army was unnecessary. The insufficiency of wages having been the cause of the discontent, as his hon. friend in a great measure admitted, the removal of that cause had restored tranquillity in the county of Surrey, and would have the same effect in other places.

Lord *Palmerston* was surprised that the hon. member for Surrey should entertain the opinion which he had expressed; nor was that surprise diminished, when he heard the opinion contradicted by the statement of the hon. Gentleman himself. At the same time that he described tranquillity to have been restored, he admitted the necessity of an increased constabulary to restore tranquillity, which he had just asserted already to exist. He denied that the object of the proposed increase of the Army was, as had been stated by the hon. Member under the Gallery (Mr. Attwood), to keep down the people. The object was, to protect the property of those who had a right to expect protection from the Government. Looking to the state of the southern counties, in which much had been done to excite those who were labouring under distress and privations, he would say, that some precaution on the part of Government was necessary for the protection of property. He agreed that the constabulary was the best force to be employed to put down domestic disorder: but yet those persons who submitted to the severe inconvenience of acting in that body for the preservation of the peace, could not be expected to do every duty, and necessarily required the assistance of an organized force. It could not be supposed that the addition of 4,000 or 5,000 more to the Army would be sufficient to supersede the necessity of employing a large constabulary, which the increase of the military was only intended to assist.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* expressed his opinion, that the noble Lord would never be able to allay the public distress by mere reduction of taxation.

Resolution agreed to.

REGENCY BILL.] The Report on this Bill was brought up, and several verbal Amendments were agreed to.

The *Attorney General* moved, as an Amendment, that in the event of the death of her present Majesty and the re-marriage of the King, this Bill should then come to an end, cease and be void.

Clause agreed to.

JUDGMENT AND EXECUTION BILL.] Sir James Scarlett moved the second reading of the Judgment and Execution Bill, on which—

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that as it was past twelve o'clock, and as there was a whole handful of legal bills to be forwarded, he should move that the second reading of the Bill should be postponed till to-morrow.

Sir C. Wetherell seconded the Amendment.

The *Attorney General* hoped, that the hon. and learned Member would not delay, by any unnecessary opposition, the business of the House. The Bill was founded on the Report of the Law Commissioners, and ought to be passed.

Mr. *Campbell* thought it would be desireable at that late hour to postpone the discussion. The Bills were of consequence; they made considerable alteration in the law, and could not be passed as a matter of course.

Sir *James Scarlett* thought it was highly wrong for one or two individuals to stop the business of the House. The measure was of importance, and if passed before next Term would remedy a serious inconvenience.

Lord *Althorp* hoped, that the hon. and learned Member would not persist in his Motion, as it would occasion great public inconvenience.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* said, the Bill was before the House last year. He understood that there was no objection to it, and therefore he hoped that the opposition to its going through a stage then would be withdrawn.

The House divided—For the Adjournment 1; Against it 41—Majority 40.

On the main question being put,

Mr. O'Connell moved the Adjournment of the House.

Sir *J. Scarlett* opposed it, as contrary to the dignity and consequence of the House to allow itself to be defeated by one individual.

Lord *Althorp* recommended the hon. and learned Gentleman to postpone the Bill.

Sir James Scarlett consented.

Mr. *Ruthven* said, it ought not to be forced on at that hour.

Sir *J. Scarlett* explained, that he did not want to force it on.

Bill ordered to be read a second time the next day.

CONTINUATION OF PATENTS—IRISH MAGISTRACY.] On the Motion of Lord *Althorp*, leave was given to bring in a Bill for extending the Commission of the Peace in Ireland for a certain time. His Lordship explained, that this Bill was necessary, as the Commissions would expire on the 26th instant, and Ireland would be left without a magistracy.

O'Gorman Mahon said, that the noble Lord would confer a great benefit on Ireland by allowing the Commissions to expire, and so put an end to the present race of Justices.

Bill, under the title of Patents Continuation Bill, brought in and read a first time.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, Dec. 14.

MINUTES.] Returns ordered. On the Motion of the Duke of RICHMOND, of the Prices of Provisions and Necessaries, as far as the same can be obtained from the books of Greenwich and Chelsea Hospitals, distinguishing each year, from the year 1795 to the year 1830:—On the Motion of the Marquis of CLEVELAND, of the quantity of Foreign Lead and Lead-ore, imported from 1st January 1830, to 1st January 1831. Also a Return of the total amount of Duty paid on the same; and also a Return of the quantity of British Lead and Lead-ore exported during the same period; the countries and places to which such exports have been made, and the periods, and from which Ports of the United Kingdom the exports have been made:—On the Motion of the Earl of GLENGALL, of the number of Processes issued in matters of Tithes from the Bishops' Courts in Ireland, from 1st November 1829, to 1st November, 1830. Also a Return of the number of Decrees issued from the same Courts in matters of Tithes during the same period; and also a Return of the Costs paid upon such decrees.

Petitions presented. For the abolition of Colonial Slavery, by Lord DACRE, from Cottingham, in Cambridge:—By Lord WYNFORD, from the Inhabitants of the Parish of Clerkenwell:—By the Bishop of LONDON, from St. Luke's, Chelsea. By Lord BEXLEY, from the Jews of London, for the repeal of their Civil Disabilities. For the repeal of the Duties on Sea-borne Coals, by the Earl of SHAFTESBURY, from Dalkeith:—By Lord DACRE, from Torquay:—By Lord WHARNCLIFFE, from various places in Yorkshire.

The Colonial Acts' Validity Bill was brought up from the Commons, and read a first time.

TITHES.] Lord *King* having to present a Petition from the inhabitants of Southampton, complaining of the grievances under which the country at present suffered, would make a few observations, which he would be unwilling to make, if he did not see in their places noble Lords to whom some allegations of the petitioners had reference. The complaints concerning the Tithes were now as general and as earnest as were formerly those complaints of taxation, which were said by a noble Lord, now no more, to originate in "an ignorant impatience." However light that noble Lord then made of those complaints, their frequency and vehemence at last effected a reduction of taxes, to the amount of more than seventeen millions. He believed that the prevailing spirit of complaint, which might, perhaps, be said to arise from "an ignorant impatience" of desolation, could not fail to bring about a similar reduction of the tithes. It was known that the farmers generally had not made much exertion to prevent the recent outrages, and it was also known, that their disinclination to interfere was occasioned by the pressure of their own burthens, of which the tithes constitute a principal part. Aware of the extent of such dissatisfaction, a reverend Prelate had last year brought before their Lordships a bill for the commutation of tithes. There was a time when such a measure might have removed the discontent, but now it would be ineffectual. Twenty years ago Mr. Pitt had devised a plan for the permanent commutation of tithes into three per cent stock; and now some measure, equally comprehensive and effectual, must be adopted. All lovers of abuses could find out something of good to be attributed to every abuse, however gross, except to tithes. They said that the Corn-laws worked well—that Colonial Slavery worked well—and that corrupt Parliaments and heavy Taxation worked well—but none of them would go so far as to pretend that tithes worked well. The ingenuity of all the Divines that ever existed, whether Jews, Catholics, or Protestants, could not prove that the tithes in any age worked well, no not the Sanhedrim, nor their successors the Conclave, nor their successors the bench of Bishops, could make out the proposition. That the tithes were injurious to the country was indisputable; but the manner of collecting them was still more so. The defenders of tithes said, indeed, that they being a tax upon the gross produce, were paid by the consumer as completely as if the tithe-receiver had his servants stationed at the baker's door, to collect the tax from the purchasers of bread as they carried it away. For his part, he (Lord King) considered it a tax upon the labour and capital of the cultivator: but as the ablest writers on political economy had not been able to settle the question, he would leave it to the reverend conservators of Church property, to the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Wynford) who so much derided the political economists, to explain the way in which the tithe impost operated. It was their interest to discover the means by which their property in that tax might be saved from the hungry jaws of the consumer, upon whom they supposed its payment ultimately devolved. For his part, he thought that impost a public nuisance. It was injurious to the landlord, for it made a positive deduction from his rent; it was oppressive to the cultivator, for it rendered the gains of his labour variable and uncertain; it was injurious to the capitalist, for it prevented the employment of capital upon land, at a time when it could find but few fields for profitable employment; and, lastly, it was impoverishing to the nation at large, inasmuch as it seriously diminished production. One effect had been, to drive land from agriculture to grass—as, with the tithe upon it, it would not pay the expense of cultivation. How stood the case with land at 10*s.* an acre? It should yield under corn, five rents, or produce 50*s.*; while under grass, it produced but 25*s.*; yet, as it paid no tithe, the landlord got two-fifths instead of one, and was as well off with the gross produce equal to 25*s.*, as he would be if it equalled 50*s.*, paying tithes. To the influence of the tithe-system he attributed the well-known fact, that less inferior land in proportion was under cultivation in England than in France, although the former country had a greater population to support, in proportion to her surface, and more abundant capital ready to be employed in cultivation. Their Lordships knew, that before the Revolution, the full tithe was never exacted there, and their Lordships knew, that since that period, tithes were altogether abolished. He was satisfied that, not even in Spain nor in Italy, where the power of the Church was excessive, were tithes exacted with half the rigour they were collected with in England. The pernicious practice of paying the wages of labourers out of the poor-rates was wholly to be attributed to the tithe-system. The farmer, through his aversion to that system, contrived to have the labourer paid in that way, in order to throw part of the burthen of wages upon the tithe-receiver, because the tithes of the parish were included in the assessment for the poor-rates. That custom had caused more mischief to the country than all the other pernicious customs that prevailed; and to this system it could clearly be traced. He did not think that any mode of commutation for a number of years would effect much good. The Act would be no better than a dead letter, for who would make an agreement for sixteen years, or lay out a large capital, subject to the sleeping partner coming in at last to share the profits. In the time of King William, 140 years ago, Scotland had acted with the usual good sense which had distinguished that country, and made a permanent and fixed Church settlement, by which capital was encouraged and agriculture improved. He wished that England would imitate the excellent example of Scotland—get rid of the tithes altogether, and make some distinct and permanent provision for the clergy. To her exemption from that system he believed Scotland owed a great part of her present excellent cultivation. Although he did not wish to speak on the subject with any appearance of bad feeling, yet he must say that, as the upholders of tithes would not be prevailed upon by such reasons as had hitherto been offered to them, they would ultimately, and before long, be compelled to yield to such arguments as last Session were so successful in obtaining another long-denied concession. He wished to see some arrangement adopted by which the lands of the Deans and Chapters, who were utterly useless as ministers of religion, should be made available for the support of the working part of the clergy. He hoped to see entirely cleared away from the Church all the cumbrous lumber of golden and of brazen Prebends, together with the Deans and Chapters. He wished that, as formerly was the case, the prelacy should be composed of men chosen from among the working clergy for their merit, by their brethren. But since the days of *præmunire*, the Prelates were no more the representatives of the clergy, than the gentlemen sitting in another place, as members for Gatton and Old Sarum, were Representatives of the people. He believed that Henry 8th was the first who used the phrase, of which their Lordships had heard so much a few evenings since, that he "would do as he liked with his own." As he (Lord King) should take another opportunity of adverting to matters alluded to in the petition, he should then conclude by presenting to their Lordships the humble petition of certain inhabitants of Southampton, praying for the redress of grievances, and for the removal of burthens, especially of the tithes.

The Archbishop of *Canterbury* was sure that the House would not expect him to follow the noble Lord through all the topics which he had introduced into his attack upon Deans, Prebends, and Tithes. In reply, however, to what the noble Lord had said respecting a bill which he had had the honour of proposing to their Lordships, he (the Archbishop of Canterbury) had to state, that a similar bill would be laid before their Lordships in the course of the present Session; from which he hoped more happy results would be derived than the noble Lord seemed to anticipate.

The Bishop of *London* said, that the noble Lord (King) had stated, with truth, that repeated and vehement attacks had of late been made upon the system of tithes. Why that sort of property should be attacked more than other property in land, which, as well as tithes, was possessed only by virtue of the laws, he (the Bishop of London) could not explain, unless it were because the clergy, of whom they were the property, were the weaker party. No man could be more firmly convinced than he was of the claims of the country, in its present state, on the consideration of their Lordships. He knew, from many years experience as a parochial clergyman, that the agricultural labourers generally were suffering under great distress; which, however, was attributable, not to the tithe-system, but to the unfortunate administration of the Poor-laws, concerning which great mistakes had been committed. Another important cause of the distress would be found in the years of false prosperity, during which all classes, both clergy and laity, except the lower orders, had acquired habits of luxury, from which it was very difficult to descend, when the appearance of prosperity had passed away. But all those classes were now, he hoped, prepared to make any arrangements which, after due deliberation, might seem likely to relieve the distress. He admitted that tithes had been raised in the same proportion as rents had been raised, and he thought it reasonable that both should go on *pari passu*. Every sound economist knew that tithes were really a second rent. If they should cease to be collected, their amount would go to increase the rent of the landlord. The clergy were entitled to their rent, not only by immemorial usage, but by tithe-deeds, as ancient and as legitimate as those by which the landlords themselves held their estates. He did not doubt that the present reverend incumbent of the parish of Oakham could produce as legal proofs of his right, as the noble Lord himself (Lord King) could produce in support of his claims to the land of that parish. He (the Bishop of London) would not assert that there were not defects in the working of the tithe-system, although he considered the principle of that system the best which could be acted upon for the support of the clergy. He could honestly repel the imputation that the tithes were collected with rigour. He knew that in most parishes the full tenth of the produce was never collected, and that in many parishes the tithe taken was not more than the one-half or one-fourth of the tenth. It had fallen to his lot to observe, that in places where, from time immemorial, tithes had been collected in kind, undisturbed harmony existed between the clergy and their parishioners; and in unfavourable weather he had known the latter frequently carry home the Rector's tenth. He by no means agreed with the noble Lord, that it would be better for the clergyman to have a fixed and invariable allowance, instead of one rising and falling with the rents. Had such a mode been adopted before the depreciation of the currency, what would since have been the condition of the clergy? Many would not have possessed an income of more than 35*l*. a year, and few more than 80*l*. So far from the truth were the shameful calumnies that had been industriously spread abroad respecting the property of the Church, that if the value of all the ecclesiastical property which remained in the hands of the clergy were collected in one fund, and divided equally amongst the whole of the clergy, it would not afford more to each than about 350*l*. a year. Now he was sure that, in the present habits of society, that was not an allowance too high for men of the education and the learning for which the clergy were distinguished. He would admit that Church property might be better distributed, if an arrangement for that purpose could be effected consistently with respect for property, and he would add—though he did so with hesitation, as it might be attributed to his selfishness—with respect for vested rights. Such an arrangement would preserve the Church of England, what she had hitherto ever been, the pride of Protestant Europe, and the honour and support of the British Constitution.

Lord *King* denied, that he had charged the Church of England with excessive rigour in the exaction of tithes; but he had said, that the claims of the clergy were enforced frequently with more rigour than those of the landlords. He believed that the clergy of the Church of England did collect its revenues more rigorously than the clergy of any Catholic country. As to what the right rev. Prelate had said respecting the tithes going on *pari passu* with the rents, he must say, that rents had fallen to one-fifth from one-third of the gross produce, whilst the tithe was still one-tenth. He would ask the right rev. Lord, what he called going on *pari passu?* No farmer in his senses would give the full value for land when taking it upon lease, for such was the fluctuation in the value of produce, occasioned by the Corn-laws, that he dared not bind himself to the full rent. Be the fluctuation what it might, the revenue of the tithe-receiver was not affected, however the landowner might suffer.

The Marquis of *Bute* thought it but justice to the clergy to declare, that in his transactions as landowner with the receivers of tithes, he had always found the ecclesiastical proprietors much less rigorous than the lay impropriators. The noble Baron was wrong in supposing that the Scotch Church was regulated in the time of King William; the particular settlement to which he alluded was carried into effect in the reign of Charles 1st. He admitted that the Scotch system, though defective, had been attended with great benefit, and he was anxious to see a permanent commutation of the tithes made in England, so arranged that the clergy might be preserved from the injurious collision of interests with their parishioners, which sometimes took place, while their rights, and the property of the Church, should be preserved.

The petition to lie on the Table.

Repeal of the Duty on Sea-Borne Coals.] Lord *Wharncliffe* rose, pursuant to notice, to present a Petition from the Lord Mayor and Corporation of the City of London, for the repeal of the Duty on Sea-borne Coals. That subject had come before their Lordships in two successive Sessions; and a committee of the House of Commons had been occupied with it. He was desirous to press upon his Majesty's Ministers, that if they found themselves enabled to diminish any part of the public burthens, the tax of which the petitioners complained especially merited their consideration. He would not hesitate to say, that no other tax was more unjust in principle, or more mischievous in operation. It enhanced the value of an universal necessary of life to the counties, which, being most distant from the place of its production, would receive it with greater difficulty, and at heavier expense, than those counties which were altogether exempt from that tax, to which they were subjected, and which to them amounted almost to a prohibition from the use of that necessary. The characteristics of the duty on coals were, that it was a tax upon industry—and upon a necessary of life—and at the same time unequal and partial in its operation. He did not know by what principle the imposition of this impolitic tax had been regulated. Perhaps it was for the purpose of enabling the English to compete with the Scotch collieries, that coals to any part of Scotland were exempt from the duty, whilst those to any part of the eastern coast of England paid 6*s*. a ton. Coals carried to Ireland paid much less than those which were conveyed to the western and southern parts of England: and Wales seemed to be equally favoured. He could not explain the principles on which these arrangements had been made. It had been said, that if those duties were taken off, the public would gain nothing, and the amount would go into the pockets of the coal-owners. But of that there could be no danger, the competition of the coal-owners themselves would prevent that. With regard to what had been said respecting the combinatiou of coal-owners to keep up the prices, the noble Lord explained, that they took care to ascertain the extent of the demand in the southern counties, and to regulate the supply to that demand. Such an arrangement was necessary for the protection of the proprietors of the lesser collieries, the produce of which was as important to the southern market as was that of the great collieries. The proprietors of those collieries had offered to farm the duties of the Government, or to pay a rent out of their own pockets, equal to the amount of the taxes. That proposal had been laid aside, from a variety of objections. One great objection to those imposts was, the excessive delay which they occasioned on the transmission of coals. From the time that coals arrived in the Pool until they reached the house of the consumer, the dues exacted exceeded their cost to the moment when they were put into the ship. The original cost per chaldron was 13*s*., which was paid to the coal-owner and the mine-worker; the freight to London about 10*s*. or 12*s*.; and the various expenses after their arrival in London amounted to 26*s*. The charge for clearance in the Port of London was most extraordinary, amounting to 26*l*., while a timber vessel, requiring a great deal more labour to unload her, was unloaded for 8*l*. Other charges in the Port of London were most exorbitant; so that, of the 50*s*. which was the average price of a chaldron of coals delivered in London, the consumer paid 25*s*. for expenses incurred after the vessel entered the river. Though he was far from wishing to call upon Ministers to express a decided opinion, yet he should be happy to hear from them, that they were not unmindful of this, among other burthens upon the people.

Earl *Grey* said, that his opinions were, perhaps, not materially different from those of the noble Lord, but in the short interval since he had taken Office, it had not been possible for him to advert, in detail, to the subject. That it well deserved consideration he was of all men the least likely to deny; for, although he had himself no property in coals, he had connections who were deeply engaged in them, and he was acquainted with many of the agents in the coal districts. He believed that the revenue derived from coals was not less than 800,000*l.* or 900,000*l.* a year—a sum not easily to be spared; and applications had been already made to him for the repeal of other taxes, the operation of which was considered not less injurious. He should be happy if he could at once propose the repeal of the duty on coals, but such a step could certainly not be taken without first taking into view all the facts, and the general taxation of the country. It was impossible for him to give a pledge beyond this—that, as the question deserved serious consideration, it should receive it.

The Petition laid upon the Table.

The Law of Scotland—Landlord's Rights.] The *Lord Chancellor* said, he rose, according to the notice which he had given last night, to introduce a Bill for the purpose of regulating what was called the Landlord's right of Hypothec in Scotland; or, in other words, the landlord's right over the produce of the tenant's land, after it legally quits the possession of the tenant. The Bill had been made necessary by a judgment of the Court of Session in Scotland, which at his suggestion their Lordships affirmed. That judgment was founded upon a Scotch law, which had become almost obsolete. The law of Scotland, in the particular referred to, differed widely from the law of England. Their Lordships were aware that in England, if the tenant owed his landlord rent, and took away his produce clandestinely, or for the purpose of concealing it, the landlord had a right to follow the produce. But if the tenant owing an arrear of rent took his corn to the open market, and made a *bonâ fide* sale, the property was validly transferred to the purchaser, and the landlord had no claim whatever to it, however large might be the arrear of rent due from the tenant. In Scotland, however, a different law prevailed. According to the law of that country, if a tenant owing rent sold his corn in market overt, not in bulk, but by sample, and the corn was delivered to the *bonâ fide* purchaser, the landlord was nevertheless at liberty to follow it, and take possession, or to demand from the purchaser, that he should repeat the price, as it was called, or in other words, pay the value of the purchase to the landlord. This certainly appeared to be a most extraordinary, unjust and extravagant right which existed in the landlord under the law of Scotland. If such law existed in this country, no man could purchase in Mark-lane, where all corn was sold by sample (the building not being capable of holding the quantity sold in any one day), without first inquiring into the state of the accounts between landlords and their tenants. It would not be sufficient to ask the tenant whether he had paid his rent to his landlord; for, wishing to sell his corn, he might answer untruly; so that the purchaser, before he could conclude the bargain with any degree of security to himself, would have to proceed to Yorkshire or to Norfolk, or wherever the landlord resided, to inquire from him whether his tenant, who offered corn for sale, owed an arrear of rent or not. Until he had been satisfied on that point, the corn-dealer could not venture to purchase. The existence of such a law in this country would lead to nothing less than to shut up Mark-lane and the Corn Exchange, and the Metropolis would shortly be in want of corn. Next to the consumers, it was quite clear that the tenants and landlords would be the greatest losers by such a state of things. Considering the natural and almost necessary consequences of such a law in England, their Lordships might ask, how it was possible that such things could go on in a great commercial and agricultural community like Scotland. He felt, with the law in such an anomalous state, great difficulty himself on this subject, and the gentlemen at the Bar knowing more of the law than of the practice of the corn-markets, were not able to satisfy him on this point. He had, therefore, communicated with some persons in Scotland, whom he thought likely to afford him information, and the result of his inquiries had been, that though the law was undoubtedly as he had stated it to be in Scotland, it was not generally known to be the law; and no one had stirred in it until the case of "Dunlop *v.* the Earl of Dalhousie," to which he had already referred, was brought before the Court of Session. The decision in that case, though strictly in consonance with the law, had excited the greatest alarm amongst all ranks of people concerned in the buying and selling of corn, and to remove that alarm, and remedy the evils which such a state of the law must lead to, when it came to be generally acted upon, he thought it necessary to introduce this Bill. So many applications had been made to him on the subject, that he found it impossible to resist them, and had consented to bring in this Bill to render the law of Scotland, in this particular, conformable to the practice which had long prevailed there. By the Bill he merely proposed to protect the rights of purchasers of corn in Scotland as they were protected elsewhere, and at the same time to preserve the public rights. The Bill certainly went to change the principle of the law, and however clear it might be that a principle of law was wrong, as he thought their Lordships should not proceed to change it without great caution, he did not intend to press the second reading of the Bill until an opportunity had been allowed of considering its provisions. The mere intimation that such a bill was about to be brought in, would prevent any serious inconvenience arising from a short delay. The rights of the landlords of Scotland were certainly affected by this Bill, and it would be, therefore, worthy of their Lordships' consideration. He also wished to attract the attention of the agriculturists of Scotland to the subject, and should therefore merely move that the Bill be read a first time and printed, in order that it might be circulated, and lie over until after the approaching recess.

Bill read a first time, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Tuesday, Dec. 14.

MINUTES.] The Patents Continuation Bill was read a second time.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. KENNEDY, the amount of Salary of the Registrar of Sasines in Scotland, for the last ten years.

Petitions Presented. Against the Duty on Coals, by Sir M. W. RIDLEY, from Newcastle. Against the Truck System, by Colonel LYGON, from Stourbridge:—By Mr. W. PATTEN, from Dudley, and from Wigan:—By Mr. LITTLETON, five from places in Monmouthshire; from the south-west district of the County of Stafford; and from Nottingham:—By Sir J. WROTTESLEY, from the Staffordshire Potteries:—By Mr. A. CAMPBELL, from Paisley:—By an hon. Member, three from Glamorganshire:—By Mr. Alderman WAITHMAN, from the Manufacturing Districts in Gloucester. By Mr. HUME, two petitions in favour of the Truck System, from the Iron Works in Denbigh. For the abolition of Slavery, by Mr. EVANS, seven from places in Leicestershire:—By Mr. HUME, from several places in Scotland. By Sir M. W. RIDLEY, for the Emancipation of the Jews, from the Unitarians of Newcastle. By Mr. JOHNSTONE, from Borrowstoness, in favour of Reform.

EVESHAM ELECTION.] The minutes of the evidence taken before the Evesham Election Committee having been presented by Mr. Dyson,

Mr. *A. Duncombe* moved, that the evidence be printed. Two objections had been made to this course by the hon. Chairman of the committee; the first on the ground of expense. Now, God forbid that he should be the means of expending one shilling of the public money in an unnecessary manner, or that he should not always be an advocate for retrenchment, yet he thought that in the present case the House and the country would not only bear him out as to the propriety of his Motion, but that they would even demand that the evidence should be printed, if he had made no proposition to that effect. As to the second objection to his Motion —namely, that it evinced a want of confidence in Ministers, who had pledged themselves to reform, he replied, that he gave them entire credit for the sincerity of their professions, and conceived, that he was only co-operating with them in bringing forward the case of a borough, in which there were 426 voters, a number in reference to which nothing was distinguishable but one mass of corruption. At the same time, he frankly admitted, that he was no reformer, in the sweeping acceptation of the term. He expressed his astonishment at the Chairman of the committee having last night moved the issuing of a new Writ, at a moment when the consideration of the evidence might have the effect of leading to the disfranchisement of the borough. The hon. Chairman had moved for the postponement of the further consideration of the Report of the committee till Thursday, conscious, as he must have been, that a new Writ having been issued in the meanwhile, a fresh election must take place. Thus the damage would be done, and the question of a deprivation of the franchise could not be raised.

The *Speaker*, before putting the question on the Motion, observed, that on no occasion since the passing of the Grenville Act had the House taken on itself to stop the issue of a Writ, when a Member was unseated by the decision of an Election Committee, unless the committee had reported its opinion as to the state of the borough. No such report had been made in the present case, and it had always been a matter of course and duty, the House being acquainted with a vacancy in the Representation from the constitutional and statutable authorities, which alone had cognizance of the fact, immediately to issue a Writ.

Mr. *Wells* thought, that the bribery merely extended to out votes.

Mr. *Maberly* said, there could be no charge made against the Chairman for moving as he had done, he not having been instructed by the committee to do otherwise than present the Report as it stood, and as it was then laid upon the Table of the House. He thought it rather strange that the minority should now come forward and seek to interrupt the regular course of proceeding in the House, for the purpose of defeating the majority. The matter in dispute, the nature of the Report to be made, for or against corruption, had been regularly debated and decided, and the committee did not report that the borough was corrupt.

The Marquis of *Chandos* said, he should move by way of Amendment on the Motion of the hon. Member, that there be a Supersedeas on the issuing of the Writ, or that a suspension of its operations do take place until after the printing of the evidence, and the further consideration of the Report of the committee.

Mr. *Ellice* suggested, that it would be better if the noble Lord would give notice of his Motion for Thursday, for which day the further consideration of the Report was fixed. There was no precedent for suspending the operation of a Writ under such circumstances as the present.

Mr. *Buller* had carefully attended to the whole case during its progress, and did not think that the evidence warranted the committee in adopting such a strong course as that of reporting its opinion of the corrupt state of the borough. It was only proved, that about twenty-five out-voters out of, he believed a total number of 450, had been guilty of corruption.

Mr. *A. Duncombe*, in reference to the remark of the hon. member for Abingdon, explained, that the Chairman of the committee gave the casting vote against reporting on the state of the borough.

Mr. *F. Baring* said, the question before the House was, on the printing of the Minutes, and of the Motion for suspending the Writ, which came before them in the form of an Amendment: he begged to say, that he thought it ought to be brought forward upon notice.

Lord *G. Lennox* said, that entire and total corruption prevailed in the borough of Evesham, and gave as an instance, that one respectable person had refused to vote for one of the returned candidates, giving as a reason, that that gentleman had not paid him the 10*l.* which had been promised at a former election.

Mr. Alderman *Thompson* could not see any objection to suspending the new Writ until after the evidence and the Report of the committee had been considered. He expressed his surprise at hearing the hon. member for Coventry, and another hon. Gentleman who spoke from the Treasury Bench, object to the noble Lord's Motion on technical grounds, especially when it was considered that the present Government was pledged to reform.

Mr. *Ellice* explained. So far from wishing to interfere in the matter, his only wish was, that the matter should be set right with the House. He neither desired to oppose the suspension of the Writ, nor the printing of the evidence. He cared not how the House might dispose of it; his only object in recommending postponement was, that the matter should have a fuller and fairer discussion in being brought forward after the evidence was in the hands of hon. Members.

Mr. *Bolton Clive* observed, that corruption had only been proved against twenty-two electors, and he thought it would be a severe measure of justice to disfranchise 456 voters on account of the offences of two-and-twenty. Common rumour pronounced the borough to be corrupt; but the mode now proposed was not the proper mode of dealing with boroughs which were looked upon as corrupt merely upon the ground of common rumour. With the case proved against it, it would have been only a waste of the time of the House to attempt to deprive it of the elective franchise; for sure he was, that no disfranchisement bill, would be permitted to pass either Lords or Commons upon the evidence brought before the committee. At the same time, if the noble Lord wished for the suspension of the Writ, he saw no objection to it.

The *Speaker* said, the question ought properly to be confined to the printing of the evidence. The noble Lord might, if he so thought fit, move for a Supersedeas, or move for the suspension of the operation of the Writ, or he might give notice, and make a motion to that effect on Thursday, when the evidence would be printed, and in the hands of Members. It would be just as easy for him then to move the

Supersedeas, or the suspension, as it was at the present moment, and more in accordance with rules of order, for it could not but be obvious that the present discussion was premature.

The Marquis of Chandos gave notice, that on Thursday he should move that the operation of the Writ be suspended.

The evidence ordered to be printed.

STAMFORD ELECTION.] Mr. *Maberly*, adverting to the Petition which was in the hands of his hon. friend, the member for Bletchingly, and which he had announced his intention of presenting that night, respecting the borough of Stamford, begged to recommend the postponement of it till after the holidays. He expected, before the resumption of business, to be in possession of a document, which, unfortunately, he had not yet obtained, that would, he anticipated, throw considerable light upon the question to be decided, and the course which the House ought to pursue.

Mr. *Tennyson* was perfectly willing to agree to postponement, if, by doing so, any advantage were to be gained; as he was most desirous of affording the noble Marquis, whose conduct was mixed up with the concerns of the borough, the fullest and fairest opportunity of preparing his defence; and he hoped if he should agree to the postponement required, that in the interval, those vindictive measures would be given up, which unhappily had been already carried too far, and he trusted that some assurance would be given to the House, that until the matter was one way or other disposed of, nothing further would proceed from the quarters to which he alluded.

General *Gascoyne* observed, that if the mode of debating petitions were universally practised, they would not get through more than one or two in the course of a year.

Mr. Maberly was proceeding to reply, when

The *Speaker* said, that the hon. Gentlemen had better consult and arrange between themselves the time when the petition should be brought forward, there being then Members to be sworn.

Mr. *Maberly* said, that he felt it was fitting he should give some answer to the question which had been put to him by his hon. friend. No man could be more disposed than he was, to promote the great objects of conciliation. If the noble Lord acted for the time under the influence of considerable excitation, it might be hoped that time would tend to diminish that. At all events he would recommend, and do all in his power to effect, reconciliation.

Mr. Tennyson postponed presenting the petition till after the holidays.

SEA-BORNE COALS.] The Sheriffs of the City of London, presented at the Bar, a Petition from the Lord Mayor and Corporation of London, against the Duty on Sea-borne Coals.

Mr. Alderman *Wood* moved, that the petition be brought up. He said, that the duty against which the petition was presented fell with peculiar severity upon the citizens of London, and all who resided in the neighbourhood of the metropolis. The operation of the tax was most partial and oppressive. It yielded about 800,000*l.*, of which 400,000*l.* was paid by the metropolis. He wished, too, that coals should be sold by weight instead of by measure.

Mr. Alderman *Thompson* assured the House, that no boon could be more acceptable to the City of London, and the inhabitants of the metropolis and its neighbourhood generally. There were many parishes in which it had been most bitterly complained of. A reduction of the expenditure to the amount of 1,000,000*l.*, would be sufficient to allow of the abolition of this tax, and therefore he hoped it would be abolished.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* supported the petition, and said, that the tax pressed with peculiar severity on the poor.

Mr. *Briscoe* said, that if a shilling duty were charged upon coals, at the mouth of the pit, it would yield quite as great a revenue as the present duty, and the arrangement would be highly beneficial to the public. Whenever the member for Devonshire brought forward a motion for the repeal of the duty, it should have his cordial support.

Sir *R. Wilson* said, that sooner or later they must come to a Property-tax, and the sooner the better, in order that the public might be relieved from the pressure of taxes, affecting industry. Every possible retrenchment ought first to be made, and every unequal and injurious tax removed, and then a tax ought to be laid on to reach all property, including that of minors, misers, and absentees, and be easy and cheap in the collection.

Mr. *Hume* said, that one-half of the duty was paid by the people of London and Middlesex. It was a heavy and oppressive charge, and one that ought to be immediately removed. He saw no reason why the Scotch should be entirely free from it, and the Irish pay only half a duty, and why the English should alone be the persons to suffer.

Mr. *Ward* also supported the petition, and observed, that the people had not derived any benefit from the last reduction of the tax on coals, in consequence of their first delaying their orders, and then making a run on the coal-market.

Mr. *Hobhouse* said, that the Property-tax, suggested by the hon. member for Southwark, might be a very good thing, but it had nothing to do with the present discussion. The tax complained of was one which affected one of the first necessaries of life, and it ought to be got rid of instantly.

Mr. *Warburton* wished to call attention to the Report made by the Committee which was last Session appointed to inquire into the subject of sea-borne coals, for the purpose of observing, that a sentence had been interpolated, which ought not to have been, in the Report. It might be altered, as it implied that the House of Commons required the consent of the City of London to do what it had the power to do of itself.

Mr. *F. Lewis*, the Chairman of the Committee, admitted that the sentence in question ought not to have been in the Report; he knew not by what oversight it had got in. There could be no doubt that steps ought to be taken to remedy the imperfection, as neither he nor any other person in the Committee had ever thought it at all necessary to ask the consent of the City of London. The paragraph related to local fees, and the City might bring in a private bill to regulate them if it pleased, but if it did not he would bring in such a bill.

The *Speaker* observed, that, in justice to the clerk, he was bound to say, that the proofs of the Report were sent to the Chairman—that he made some corrections—that the omission of the sentence in question was not among those corrections—and that the Report was circulated as it came from the hands of the Chairman.

Mr. *F. Lewis* was willing to take his share of the responsibility, but not more than his share. As the Committee agreed to the Report, so it was presented to the House; and, he must observe, that the proof of the Report was never sent to him nor seen by him.

The *Speaker* said, that the proof that was brought before him had Mr. Lewis's corrections preceding and succeeding the paragraphs in question; and it was represented to him that those corrections were in the hand-writing of the Chairman of the Committee.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* said, that he would support the repeal of this tax, though it would be of no benefit to Scotland; but, at the same time, he thought that no tax ought to be repealed without considering how the deficiency was to be filled up.

Petition to be printed.

Corporations of Galway and Kilkenny (Ireland).] Mr. *Leader* said, he rose to present several Petitions relative to the state of Ireland—two of them wholly connected with the estates of the Corporation of Kilkenny and Galway; three for the Repeal of the Legislative Union; two relative to the Grants to the Kildare-street Society. He now prayed the immediate attention of the House to the case set forth in the Kilkenny Petition. It was from the citizens and inhabitants of that city, which was still the first inland city in Ireland, where Parliaments had anciently been held, and which contained above 30,000 inhabitants. It stated, that James the 1st, to improve the condition of the inhabitants, gave to them an excellent Municipal Constitution, and that the King carefully distinguished the different branches of government, and provided that the laws for the common utility of the city should be made by the Mayor and citizens, assembled for that purpose by public summons, and placed the executive power in different hands, and gave the election of all civic offices to the Mayor and citizens. That his Majesty made the inhabitants of Kilkenny the exclusive objects of his bounty, and limited the right of citizenship to them only. It stated, that a compact was entered into between two individuals and their respective partizans in the Aldermanic body, to revolutionize the government of this ancient city, and to substitute a narrow, illiberal, and oppressive oligarchy for the excellent Municipal Constitution granted by his Majesty. That this oligarchy consisted of two individuals, styling themselves, or styled by their followers, "the heads of the Corporations," and of two select bodies, the Aldermen and Common Council, and resorted to the settled policy of excluding the resident inhabitants from the two select bodies; and that, accordingly, all the inhabitants of this great city are actually excluded, except a quorum, which was made to consist of six Aldermen and nine Councilmen, all the rest of the corporate body being composed of foreigners and absentees. It states, that at the last general election the two select bodies held a meeting on the day preceding the election, at a late and unusual hour of the night, and actually admitted no less than sixty persons, non-residents, and total strangers to the city, in favour of one of the candidates, the nominee of the guardian of the Earl of Dysart, and one of the said proprietors. It states, that the indignation of the populace was with difficulty restrained from excesses at the late election against such strangers and foreigners, whom they considered intruders and invaders of their just rights—that public business is impeded from the want of resident Aldermen and Councilmen, and administration of justice retarded; — that the Sheriffs and Coroners are not annually elected, according to the express provision of the Charter, which would appear, by a reference to the Reports of the Commissioners of Legal Inquiry relating to the office of Sheriffs in Ireland; that the trade and manufactures of the city have been injured, and the city revenues wrested from the citizens, and the greatest abuses and confusion have been introduced into the city since the management and control of the city property have been usurped by a self-interested oligarchy. It states that large grants of property, in lands, tithes and tolls, were made to the Mayor and Citizens from time to time, for the support and improvement of the city, and that those grants, at the present day, would produce an income of at least 10,000*l.* per annum, and the disposal and expenditure of this ample revenue was expressly confided to the Mayor and Citizens. The petitioners, lastly, complain that this large and ample revenue has been squandered and dissipated— that grants and leases in perpetuity have been made of extensive tracts of land and valuable houses, at nominal rents, to the successive members of the two select bodies; and that this profligate system of corporate rapacity has been carried to such an extent, that the whole of the city property is not now supposed to produce more than 2,000*l.* per annum;—that of this reduced income, not one-half is disbursed in supporting the City Establishment and defraying all expenses of a public nature —that the residue is applied to the private use of a few individuals, who conceal from the citizens the nature and amount of the corporate property, the mode of expenditure, and arrogantly assume to be free from all responsibility, by which means the poor of the city have been brought to great distress, when, if properly applied, the corporate funds would have afforded ample employment in improving and embellishing the city;—that this system is upheld by an oath of secresy, and that the citizens are excluded from every right and advantage which they justly claimed under their excellent Municipal Constitution. They, therefore, pray, that as the City Constitution granted by Royal Charter has been subverted, the rights and privileges of a populous city has been invaded and monopolized by an oppressive oligarchy, its elective franchise seized upon, its revenues misapplied and dissipated, and finally, inasmuch as the usurpations, abuses, and mischiefs complained of, are at once so multifarious and so enormous in their nature, as to be totally beyond the reach of redress by the ordinary Courts of Justice, the petitioners pray, that the consideration of their case may be referred to a committee, and that the House will provide such remedy, by Statute or otherwise, as has been granted in similar cases, and as will prevent the recurrence of similar usurpations and oppression. Such was the Kilkenny case, said the hon. Member, and he had now to implore the House to hear a few words, which would open their mind to the state of the Corporations of Ireland, and be better than the examination of thousands of witnesses, with their testimonies recorded in folios of blue books. The Corporation of Galway complained that their ancient city, to which Charters upon Charters had been given, which made residence an essential qualification for freedom, had its Corporation reduced to seventy-two Protestant merchants and traders, and 1,800 military and peasant absentees; that their unrivalled Constitution was subverted—that their rights were transferred to the military, acting under the command of a stranger—and as evidence of the deplorable state to which their ancient city is reduced, they pressed the fact, that the individuals who have exercised influence over the Corporation have alienated and divided the corporate estates amongst themselves, which now yield a revenue of more than 10,000*l.* a-year, leaving the Corporation without a vestige of property, and not only wholly insolvent, but, as it appears from a decree of the Irish Court of Chancery, upwards of 10,000*l.* in debt; that the funds for public improvement were not alienated, because from their nature they were inalienable, but that every shilling of them has been misapplied since the year 1793, amounting to upwards of 300,000*l.*, down to last year, when they had been taken into the custody of the Great Seal, for malversation; that the offices of Mayor and Sheriffs have been held by absentees for many years in succession; that the late Mayor was in office for fourteen years, the last Sheriffs for seven years, and that one of the Sheriffs has been permanently absent ever since the year 1793;—that the Church of Galway was established by Charter of the 5th Edward 6th, and is composed of a Warden and eight Vicars (elected by the Protestant freemen); that the said clergy have the ecclesiastical care of the nine parishes, occupying a district of 600 square miles, and comprising 100,000 inhabitants; but notwithstanding this extent, and vast increase of population since the year 1793, eight of those parishes have been left without a single resident clergyman—six of those vicarages have been, during the whole of that period, left vacant, although the income of the Church has increased in the interval from 500*l.* to 1,800*l.* a-year, and that the disfranchisement of their Protestant parishioners would leave the appointment of the clergy, as well as that of the Representatives, in the hands of military and peasant absentees. Having thus brought these petitions under the consideration of the House, he would confine himself, for the present, to those exclusively. Petitions from other Irish Corporations he had already presented, and more, he was afraid, it would fall to his lot to present. Was the system of Corporation plunder longer to be endured? He held in his hand a Resolution, passed at a recent public meeting in the City of Kilkenny, stating, that at a period previous to the Union, 4,000 persons, out of a population of 7,000, had been employed in the woollen manufacture; that the population of one parish is now 10,000, and that not more than 100 persons are now employed in that trade, and this even not for one-third of the year; whilst the master-manufacturers are breaking stones on the road—their houses are in ruin, and they themselves reduced to beggary. Was it surprising, these abuses existing since the Union in Ireland, that the population of those great cities should apply to the measure of a repeal of the Union, or to any measure which they considered calculated to alleviate their distress? He relied on it, that it was only in that House that the ardent solicitude for the repeal of that measure could be extinguished or even suppressed. A right hon. and highly and deservedly esteemed Gentleman, the member for Weymouth, had applied to him (Mr. Leader) to know what course he intended to pursue relative to the Kilkenny petition. He had informed him, that he meant to name a day when he should move for a committee, to which the petition should be referred; and that right hon. and learned Member had expressed himself satisfied with that mode of procedure. All he could say upon the subject was, that requiring nothing but an Act of Parliament in aid of the Charter, and strictly conformable to it, and even to the usage of the Corporation, and for correcting the usurpation and abuses which had crept into it, he had but two courses to pursue—and for both of which he had precedents in that House—either to resort to the Bill the present Lord Chancellor of England had formerly introduced to that House, with the view of restoring the ancient law requiring residence in Corporate towns as an essential for the freedom of the elective franchise, or to resort to the precedent of the Limerick Act of Parliament which was brought in about the same time by the hon. member for Limerick. He conceived that no solid objection could be offered to his adoption of the wise and salutary measure which had originated with that gifted and quick-sighted individual, who was as ready to apply remedies to existing abuses as he was intelligent in discovering them; but inasmuch as his Lordship's measure did not embrace the regulation of offices, or secure the due administration of the Corporate revenues, but was confined to the elective franchise; and as he (Mr. Leader) looked for a practical redress of admitted abuses, and to prevent the malversation of the public revenue of the City, he preferred adopting the precedent which had passed into a law in the Limerick case, and claimed the benefit of that precedent because he could bring forward facts equally strong to warrant it. So satisfied was he of the merits and justice of the Kilkenny petitioners, that he would fearlessly submit their petition, and hereafter the Bill for their relief, to the able and distinguished Gentleman who had appeared to him to feel an interest in the preservation of the Corporate rights of the City of Kilkenny. He disclaimed every intention of intermeddling injuriously with vested rights. He would not seek any innovations. He wanted no unconstitutional exercise of power. He only desired to make the rights and property confirmed by Charter auxiliary to the great work of improving and embellishing an ancient City, and enable it again to compete with cities which had been more honestly and wisely governed. He wished, when a universal call was making for the repeal of the Union in Ireland, to show them, that the British Parliament was not wholly indifferent to the just causes of Irish complaint.

The Earl of *Ossory* said, that he was afraid many of the statements contained in the petitions were exaggerated, but at the same time he hoped that the hon. Gentleman would persist in referring them to a committee. Nothing could more conduce to the peace of that part of the country than a full understanding of the subject.

Mr. *O'Connell* was glad to hear such sentiments fall from the noble Lord, whose family was so much connected with that part of the country. He did not rise to enter into this subject at present, but to put a question to the noble Lord (Althorp) on a subject of considerable importance to the country. His question was founded on a declaration which he had heard made by the noble Lord who was at the head of the law in this kingdom, that the learned Baron now at the head of the Court of Exchequer was not competent to discharge the duties of the situation. A similar case occurred in one of the Courts in Ireland, and he alone had petitioned against the continuance of that Judge in office. It was of the utmost importance that persons filling such high stations in our Law Courts should be in every respect fully competent to perform the duties of their office. He had heard a rumour, which he hoped might turn out to be correct, that the place of Chief Baron was to be conferred on a noble and learned person, than whom he knew of no man better qualified to preside over a Court of Common Law. The question which he was about to ask had been asked in another place, but not feeling satisfied with the answer there given, he wished to put it to the noble Lord, from whom he hoped to get a satisfactory answer. What he wanted to know was, whether the Chief Baron of the Exchequer had resigned, or was about to resign that office?

Lord *Althorp*.—In answer to the hon. and learned Member's question, I say that I do not know, but I believe he is not.

Lord *Killeen*, referring to the petitions presented by the hon. and learned member for Kilkenny, said that some of the petitioners were for a repeal of the Union, that he was aware that those who were very zealous in support of that question were not actuated by any feeling of disloyalty. They no doubt were strongly impressed that a federal union of the two kingdoms, under the Crown of England, would be greatly for the advantage of Ireland, and that a Parliament resident in Dublin would be found a remedy for much of the distress that existed in Ireland. If he thought that it would have these effects, he would cordially join with those who supported it; but the connexion of Ireland with England was calculated to promote the prosperity of both; and he feared that the connexion would be weakened by the repeal of the Union. As a Representative of a populous place, he felt it his duty to express his opinion on this important question. He was fully aware of what might be the consequence of such a declaration, for he felt that a repeal of the Union would, at the next election in Ireland, be made the touchstone of most candidates, and though he might become the victim of this declaration, he felt it due to himself and to those who sent him to Parliament, to make it. He valued popular opinion as much as any man, and he hoped that in the short time during which he had had the honour of a seat in that House, he had endeavoured to do his duty; but there, as well as elsewhere, he did not think he ought to profess any opinions but those he really held.

The petitions ordered to be printed.

The Truck System.] Mr. *Littleton* said, it was a great satisfaction to him, after the disappointment, occasioned by the dissolution of Parliament, of the numerous class of the population for whose benefit he desired to introduce a measure against the Truck-system, and after the rapid extension given to that system, that he had thus early an opportunity of introducing a measure for putting an end to it. At the same time, he much regretted that a subject so materially affecting the capital, the industry, and the trade of the country had not fallen into better and abler hands. It might happen that some Gentlemen who lived in the remote and more agricultural districts of the country were not acquainted with the bearings of the system, so as to form an opinion of its evil tendency. But, at the same time, the subject was so notorious—its effects had been so frequently discussed—its abuses were so flagrant, and its dangers were so imminent, that he trusted such Gentlemen would defer somewhat to the judgment of those who, by living in the districts where the system was in operation had more competent means of forming an opinion on the subject. The facts that he intended to quote would not be confined to any particular district, but were the result of a pretty extensive acquaintance with the system in every part of this island—he said, of this Island, because he did not intend to include the kingdom of Ireland within his Bill, as, unfortunately, its manufactures were not extensive enough to have given rise to the introduction of this system. Though, for the last 400 years, there had been something of this system existing among the population of this country, yet it was only during the last 130 years that it had assumed that character which had gradually led to the mischief which they now saw. But he begged, in the first place, to call the attention of the House to what was the nature of this system. It was the payment of labour in goods or provisions instead of money; and the mode in which it was carried on by the manufacturers was, to set up a large shop or store, containing all sorts of necessaries for their workmen; so that, instead of paying them money for their wages, tickets were given to these shops, or, in other instances, periodical visits to them were allowed to the mechanic or his wife, and they chose those things that they most stood in need of. Under these circumstances, money was very seldom paid, or, rather, never at all, in point of fact; for though parties sometimes, to evade the law, gave the money to their workmen, yet, before they quitted the premises, it was all received back again. The shops of which he had spoken were generally kept by some relative or servant of the master, put in for that purpose; or when the tradesman did not resort to such measures on his own account, he made an arrangement with the retailer, who agreed to allow him a discount. But the more needy the manufacturer, the greater his advantage, under this system; for he was enabled to stock his shop for three months, and then pay for that stock with a bill at another three months; so that, instead of paying his workmen ready money, he was obtaining a six months' credit. He did not mean to assert that there was a regular contract among the masters; but it was always an understood thing, that a man discharged for objecting to this system should not be taken in by any other employer. And, indeed, this seemed almost naturally to follow; for, when it was once known that a man had lost his employment by objecting to this mode of payment, it was not likely that another master, who paid in exactly the same way, would give him employment. He admitted, that amongst the smaller manufacturers there were some exceptions, but they were the persons who generally practised the truck-system. He admitted, at the same time, that some among the larger manufacturers also practised it. They were obliged to do it for their own protection, and the system was rapidly spreading. Notwithstanding the warning which had been given last Session, many new practitioners had entered into it. He would not go into any details on the system, as he had before entered so largely into the subject, but he might remark, that generally, the truck-masters charged their men from fifteen to twenty per cent more than the market prices, and he had known them charge so much as 100 per cent. The truck-masters, in order to keep their men dependent, would not allow them to keep pigs, and he had heard of a case in which the workmen had been obliged to put away these animals before they could get work. He had heard from a Magistrate [*"Name, name;" by Mr. Hume*]—he hoped that his character was sufficient to satisfy the House that he would not impose any untrue statement on it.

Mr. *Hume* had no doubt of the hon. Member's word, but the name of the Magistrate might throw a light on his statement.

Mr. *Littleton:* He was satisfied that the hon. Member would not desire him to name his author, but he could assure the House of the correctness of the statements. The hon. Member then detailed a variety of instances of hardship suffered by workmen from truck-masters. Such as one man receiving a cheque for 10*s.*, and his wife carrying it to the master, who would only give her 9*s.* 9*d.* worth of flour, and refused her 3*d.* to buy yeast to bake that flour into bread. [The hon. Member restated also most of the cases he had stated last year, and quoted a tract containing similar illustrations of the truck-system, at great length.] The consequences of this system were so bad, that the workmen were obliged to pay their rents, and rates, and other dues, in commodities. They received no money, and were obliged to pay in truck. But in addition to the many abuses he had mentioned last year, there was one which had lately grown up, and was the consequence of the Beer bill, which had been passed last Session. Many masters took out licenses under that bill, and they paid their men to a certain extent in beer. Of course, the beer they supplied them with was not of the best quality, and, in fact, it was very often more like ditch-water than beer. The masters had thus a motive to make their men drunken, and if the Legislature had any regard to the morality of the working classes, they would put an end at least to this part of the system. If no steps were taken, drunkenness among the working classes would undoubtedly increase. The hon. Member, as a further illustration of the system, quoted a speech delivered at Paisley about ten days before, in which it was stated, that a young woman who had earned 20*s.* was obliged to take two shawls for which she could only obtain 10*s.* To show its effect in decreasing trade, he referred to the market-tolls at Bilston, which in 1825 amounted to 343*l.*, and in the last year to only 182*l.* In fact, a vast deal of the misery now existing among the people might be traced to the prevalence of the truck-system. The masters who did not yet practise it—who continued to pay their workmen in money —would be driven into it if they were not protected, as it was impossible that they could compete against those truck-masters who paid twenty-five per cent less for labour than they paid. The large masters were determined, if they received no protection from the Legislature also to adopt this system. They prayed the Legislature to protect them; they desired to avoid being driven into this disgraceful and dishonourable practice; but they could not sit still and see their capital melt away; and if their fair and honest exertions were not protected, they must act on the same plan as their neighbours. It was too bad that only those men could be successful who continually violated the law. It would be said, perhaps, that these great masters might leave the trade, but that was not so easy; they had large quantities of fixed capital, of buildings and machinery, which they could not dispose of—which they were obliged to keep going, and which they could neither stop nor dispose of without great injury. The Legislature ought not to suffer such men to be ruined for the advantage of others, who both injured the workmen and violated the law. It affected another class most seriously, and that was the shop-keepers. As had been said by a friend of his, this system cut down the shop-keepers as with a two-edged sword. It cut off their natural customers, it so impoverished the poor, that they had nothing to lay out with them, and they (the shop-keepers) at the same time had additional rates to pay to support the men whom the truck-masters had reduced to poverty. The shop-keepers were in many places seriously injured by the truck-system. It did not, however, seem very advantageous to the truck-masters, or rather, they were a description of persons whom no advantages could make prosper; and of twenty in one place, eighteen or nineteen had become bankrupts. The land-owners were also much injured by this system. The population were, in seasons of activity, drawn into the manufacturing towns, and when that season was past, they were returned to the country, and became a burthen in their own parishes to the land-owner. The system engendered low prices and a superabundance of labourers, and injured in every way the unfortunate workmen. The hon. Member then referred to the manner in which the law had grown up to its present state. The first Act on the subject was passed in the 4th of Edward 4th, in 1465. That was a period of civil war; battles were fought in the country, and society was disorganised. The City of London was then inundated with foreign manufactures, and there were not less than 15,000 foreigners in London. The natives were in a manner driven away, and the truck-system was introduced by the foreigners. To repress this grievance the law was passed. It was a sharp, stringent law, and imposed heavy penalties on the master, equal to treble the amount of the wages of the men. The law continued unaltered till the reign of Elizabeth, when two Acts were passed of a local nature; but for 138 years little was heard of truck. The law continued so till the reign of Anne, when it was relaxed, and by the 1st of George 1st the penalties were lowered to 20*s*. The result of this was, that great distress ensued in several districts, disturbances followed, and a large part of the country was convulsed. The Parliament for three years—in 1725, 1726, and 1727—was employed in examining into the state of the country, and one of the results was, that a bill was passed to regulate the payment of wages, and repress the truck-system. The truck-masters, however, interfered with this enactment, and got inserted in it a clause, that the workmen should receive part of the penalty; and the consequence was, that this Act of Parliament was null, and of no effect. By the 22nd of George 2nd the law was again relaxed, and the payment of the wages of workmen in goods allowed. The consequence of this was, that great distress again ensued, whole districts were the prey of the truck-system, riots again broke out, and the Government was obliged to draw a cordon of troops round the manufacturing districts of the West of England. The following year the Act was wholly repealed. The only Act, he believed, subsequent to that time was the 1st of George 4th, which he had brought in, and in which he adopted the language of the Statute of Elizabeth; but for want of power, that Statute was not effectual. Such was the present state of the law, and he would proceed to point out what he meant to do by the Bill he proposed to introduce. He proposed, then, first, to prohibit the indirect practice of paying wages by goods, or making contract for that purpose. He would give the Magistrates a power to get a direct proof of the practice, and would enable the workmen to recover their wages by a summary process. He would submit their case also to Jurors, as better qualified than Magistrates, to give a correct decision; and allowing the labourers to appeal to a Jury would give publicity to bad cases. He meant, also, to take from truck-masters the power of recovering anything they might advance on credit to their workmen. The compelling the masters to pay wages in money would operate to make them pay periodically, and at short periods. He also proposed to make the Bill of a stringent nature, for it would be idle to attempt to make it effectual without imposing very heavy penalties. To remove one objection, he would enable the Privy Council, on application being made to it by the Magistrates of any district, to suspend the operation of the Act in that district. Such were the objects he contemplated by his present Bill, which did not differ much from the bill he had introduced last Session. He knew that the hon. member for Middlesex would oppose the Bill, and he should beg leave to anticipate some of his arguments. He knew that that hon. Member would say, that the truck-master was driven to this system by Corn-laws and heavy taxation; but he would tell that hon. Member, that any possible reduction which could be made in taxation, or any abolition of monopoly, or the total repeal of the Corn-laws, would not relieve the distress of the people. The truck-system was the cause of the distress, and that would not be touched by any one of these measures. The hon. Member would say, leave it to competition—that competition would cure the evil. He admitted that competition was great, but he did not think that any success or any defeat could make the truck-masters give up the system. In 1824 and 1825, when trade was brisk, when all the manufacturers were in a most prosperous state, he had not heard that one of the truck-masters had given up his plan. He stated that fact as an answer to many of the statements of the hon. member for Middlesex. With respect to injuring the truck-masters by his measure, it would not, most probably, be passed before June, and he meant that it should not come into operation till three months after it was passed, so that the truck-master would have till September to make new arrangements. The people wished for this Bill as a protection—the great capitalists demanded it as the means of preventing them from engaging in the same business. The hon. member for Middlesex meant, he believed, to move for a committee, with a view to have all the laws referred to it which related to the subject. He could only repeat, that all classes with whom he had had any communication demanded some measure of protection to save them from ruin. If the practice were good, why not make it universal? Surely that which was good at Paisley must be good at Glasgow, and that which was good at Bolton could not be injurious at Manchester. Unless the House wished to see the system become universal—unless it was prepared to see money banished from the manufacturing districts—unless it wished that all the workmen in the kingdom should be paid their wages in goods of an uncertain nature —unless the House desired to see all these things, it would take measures to put a stop to the truck-system, and it would second him in his efforts to pass this Bill. The hon. Member then referred to a passage in the works of Adam Smith, which agreed with his view of this question, and observed, that his lamented friend, Mr. Huskisson, had extracted it, with the intention, if Providence had spared his life, of reading it in that House, in support of the Motion which he had then the honour to make, for bringing in a Bill to put an end to the truck-system. The hon. Member concluded by moving for leave to bring in a Bill to Consolidate and Amend the Laws relating to the Payment of Wages in Goods.

Mr. *Wilson Patten* seconded the Motion. He was satisfied, that some measure of this kind was absolutely necessary for the protection of the workmen, though he did not think it necessary, after the able statement of his hon. friend, to follow that up by any remarks of his own.

Mr. *Hume*, in rising to offer his decided opposition to the hon. member for Staffordshire's Bill, at that the earliest opportunity, was willing to bear testimony to the purity of the motives with which the hon. Member brought it forward. If the House would hear him for a short time, he hoped to be able to give a sufficient answer to all the arguments which his hon. friend had advanced in support of the Motion; and to prove that the distress, of which they had heard so much, and which he certainly did not feel disposed to underrate, was due to anything rather than to the system which this Bill was intended to do away with. He must declare for himself, that he was as warm a friend to the working classes as his hon. friend, and he would admit, that labourers were sometimes imposed on by truck-masters. His opposition to the hon. Member's proposition was twofold. In the first place, he deprecated it as contrary to the soundest principle of political science, which forbad the unnecessary, and, as he would show in the present instance, mischievous interference of Parliament, in matters which had better be left to be adjusted by the competition of capitalists and labourers, and the common sense of the mutual interests of workman and employer; and in the next place, without impugning the veracity of the hon. Member himself, he knew that the statements on which the hon. Member founded his motion were *ex parte*, got up, in a manner, for the occasion; and, what was most important, were in the very teeth of the results of very accurate and extensive inquiries made by himself and others. It was absurd to impute to the truck-system any material portion of the distress of the working classes, and it was erroneous to speak of that system as cruel and oppressive to the workman. He placed every reliance on the good sense and intelligence of the working classes, as the best judges of their own interests: and he knew that they would be unanimous in their demand for some change in the law if the present system operated as the hon. Member alleged. His hon. friend had in a manner prejudged the question, by the great number of opprobrious epithets, such as cruel, unjust, wicked, &c., which he had applied to the system. That was not right, nor did he think that masters who paid their men honestly in goods instead of money, as many of the truck-masters did, deserved to be so stigmatized. Parliament should stand aloof from vulgar prejudices, like those entertained by many well-intentioned but imperfectly informed persons, concerning the truck-system, and be guided by reason and dispassionate opinion alone, when legislating between workmen and their employers. If it did so, he was sure it would withhold its sanction from the hon. Member's proposition. He must say, that the language which had been used in Parliament, did not correspond with that dispassionate view which Parliament ought to take; and that language was well calculated to produce much dissatisfaction, and might even lead to much mischief. What he wanted was inquiry, and he contended, that it was not fit for that House to legislate on such an important subject without inquiry. His hon. friend had referred to the times of the Plantagenets, and gone back full 400 years, in order to show the increasing evils of the system; but his hon. friend would also find, during the same period, a multitude of laws to stop the practice of forestalling and regrating, which the ignorance of the time set down as a grievous evil, and an offence which ought to be punished. No laws, however, which the Legislature of the time had been able to devise, could stop the practice; and no laws which the Legislature could devise now would put an end to the system of barter between the masters and the workmen, if it suited their convenience to adopt it; and as to the distress among the workmen, of which they had been told it was the cause, he was confident he should be able to prove that the distress no more followed the working of the truck-system than the high price of provisions was to be taken formerly as a consequence of the system of forestalling and regrating. In his opinion, the workmen and the masters should be left to themselves, and to the bargains which their wants or wishes allowed them to enter into, just in the same manner as trade was now left unshackled by the laws against forestalling. The Legislature, by its interference, would merely add to the evils which it intended to cure; and he trusted, therefore, that no such measures as those contemplated by his hon. friend would receive the assent of the House, until a Committee of Inquiry had established their necessity. That inquiry he demanded from the House, and he was confident, if it was granted him, that he should be able to disprove nearly the whole of the statements on which his hon. friend supported his motion for leave to bring in the Bill. The hon. Member said, that this Bill was required by all the great capitalists. He did not believe it to be so. He knew many great capitalists who did not require a bill of this kind, or who had expressed no opinion about it; but this he knew well, that without the truck-system, it would be impossible for many small capitalists to carry on their business. It was solely by the profits—the small profits, which they received from this method of payment, that the small capitalists were able to go on; and he was convinced, that if the Bill were passed, three parts of them would be compelled to abandon their trades, and to throw the workmen out of employment. If the rule which the hon. Member wished to apply were good for one trade, why was it not good for another? The hon. member for Staffordshire had excepted from the operation of his Bill, several branches of industry—he had excepted all domestic and agricultural servants, all miners, all persons working in iron-ore, rock-salt, and stone digging. Now, he would ask those Gentlemen who supported the principles of free trade in that House, so far at least as regarded the doctrine of non-interference between master and seller, how they could bring themselves to place only one part of the community, and some trades, under the operation of this Bill? It was well known that in Scotland the labourers were often paid partly in money, and partly in articles, the produce of the farm on which they worked. Some of them had an allowance of meal, some an allowance of so many pounds of meat, some even a house. He put it to the good sense of Parliament to consider how they could interfere with one class of labourers in one part of the country, and not interfere with another class in another part of the country, who were paid in the same manner in point of principle. On what principle would they allow a master cabinet-maker to *tommy* his men, and prevent an iron-master from doing so too? He wished them to explain this inconsistency, or rather, he ought to say, this absurdity, if they could. He was convinced that the masters recurred to this truck-system from the pressure of distress, and from a desire to make the profits of the retail system available in carrying on their wholesale dealings. If that were the case, why ought the House to interfere between the master-manufacturer and his men? Another reason for adopting the truck-system was, that the master-manufacturer was often obliged, by the situation of his works, to establish a store near them, from discovering that his men could not otherwise be supplied with the necessary articles of life without paying an extravagant price for them. In a petition which he had presented that night upon this subject, the petitioners stated, that at Rualan, where the British Iron Company had established a manufactory, a store had been established on the works, by which they had been enabled to make their wages go much further in the purchase of provisions than they had gone before its establishment. A similar case had occurred within his own knowledge in the neighbourhood of Lanark, where a factory was established, which kept 1,800 or 1,900 persons in continual employment. The last time he passed through that town, he had inquired how these parties were supplied with the necessary provisions of life. The master and foreman of the works, and many of the men, assured him in reply, that if it had not been for a store established on the premises, all the men must have been discharged, from the impossibility of procuring, at a reasonable rate, the supplies necessary for existence. The mills, of which he was speaking, were at the distance of a mile and a half from the town of Lanark, on the banks of a river, and near a hamlet which contained only a few houses to accommodate the workmen. After the mills were built, it was found upon trial that retail shops for candles, groceries, meal, and provisions, could not be supported in that hamlet, unless they charged prices for the articles in which they dealt far above their intrinsic value, and consequently, far above the ability of the workmen to purchase. The consequence was, that a store was established, where any thing might be purchased, from a bottle of wine to a pint of beer, from a silk gown to a dish-clout, from an article of comparative luxury to an article of the most necessary domestic purposes. The price charged for the different commodities sold at this store was not greater, but less, than the price charged at the retail shops in Lanark. He was informed, moreover, by two respectable persons who resided in the neighbourhood, that they found the articles sold there of such superior quality, that instead of sending to Lanark for what they wanted, as they had been accustomed to do, they now sent to this store for them. Between 600 and 700 families, amounting to nearly 2000 persons, derived their subsistence from the employment which they derived from this factory. When an individual was first engaged at it, his wages were fixed at 16*s.* or 20*s.* a week, as the case might be. There was no compulsory clause in his engagement binding him to deal at the store; but the day on which he was engaged, he took from the clerk of the works, if he was so inclined, a credit upon the store up to a certain amount of his wages. If his wages were 16*s.* a week, he took at the commencement of his engagement a credit for 8*s.* or 12*s.* a week, and afterwards, as he became known, he was allowed to take a credit for the whole amount. This credit he gave to the storekeeper, who entered his name in his books, and gave him in return a book to check his accounts. He took away with him such articles as he wanted, and no others were sent to him, unless the check-book was returned to the storekeeper to have their amount regularly entered. He had seen these books, and they were kept with a regularity worthy of imitation in higher quarters. He had also seen the books of the store, and therefore could speak with some degree of certainty as to its profits. What did the House suppose they were? He had seen the bills sent in for the different articles sold there. He had seen that every article purchased for them was of the best quality, and purchased at the wholesale price, and from that he had ascertained, that the profits on their sale never exceeded ten per cent. Out of these profits four schools were maintained, for the benefit of the children of the persons employed on the establishment. There was an infant school for the youngest children, and other schools, rising one above the other, in regular succession, until the last, where children were instructed in reading, writing, and accounts, until they reached the age of twelve years, the age at which they were taken into this manufactory. There was also a school for girls, in which they were taught every thing that could be useful to them as housewives and mistresses of families. Now, if the House were to pass the present Bill, and to allow the powers of it to be extended to Scotland, they would do irreparable injury to this excellent and well-conducted establishment. He therefore called upon the House, before it consented to legislate upon this subject, to ascertain the real facts of the case, and to see whether the evil which they were going to inflict by the new law, would not be greater than the evil occasioned, or said to be occasioned, by the old law. But, said his hon. friend, the evils of this system are generally felt throughout the whole country. On that point he was completely at issue with his hon. friend. Look at Glasgow, it was a large manufacturing town, and one of those places in which his hon. friend had stated that there had been a great abuse of this system. The last time that he was at Glasgow he determined to institute some inquiries into that subject. It so happened that on the very first evening of his arrival at Glasgow he was in company with a gentleman very well known in that House, Mr. Kirkman Finlay. That gentleman employs 700 or 800 workmen; and when he questioned him regarding the existence of the truck-system at Glasgow, he (Mr. K. Finlay) told him that he had never heard of its existence in that place or its neighbourhood. He was told, however, that it certainly did exist at Mr. Dunlop's Colliery, which was a few miles from Glasgow, and Mr. Finlay's surprise on receiving that information was excessive. And yet there were not less than 35,000 or 40,000 workmen employed at Glasgow. What followed? A person was sent from Bolton to get up a petition at Glasgow against this system—a public meeting of the operatives was called; but, in consequence of the representations which he and others made to them, no petition was sent. He did not mean to deny that there were evils in the present system, but they were evils of a nature that could not be remedied by legislative enactments. Why, then, should they add another penal Statute to the thirteen or fourteen penal Statutes which already had been passed to repress their growth? He hoped that the noble Lord who now filled the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer would never consent to pass this Bill without instituting an inquiry as to its necessity. His hon. friend had stated, that all the capitalists of the country were opposed to this system. On this point he was afraid that his hon. friend was guilty of some unintentional exaggeration. He had himself conversed on this subject with many capitalists, and if his hon. friend wished to know how their opinions tended, he had only to inquire of Bolton and Watt. Had they petitioned against the system? He could mention many other capitalists who entertained the same notions as himself on this question, but he deemed it unnecessary, as the opinion of such men as Bolton and Watt was sufficient, he thought, to make hon. Members pause before they legislated in direct contradiction to it. He admitted, however, that there were capitalists who were influenced by different sentiments and feelings. He knew who they were, and had paid some attention to their locality, and he had discovered that they were anxious to put down the small master-manufacturers in their neighbourhood, who endeavoured to increase the capital of their wholesale business by the profits which they derived from this retail trade. What would be the consequence, if these large capitalists succeeded? — a monopoly of employment; they would have but few individuals carrying on business; labour would, of course, become more abundant; and the great bulk of the workmen of the country would be placed at the mercy of a few wealthy individuals. He, therefore, thought that it was an object of great importance not to let the House proceed hastily in the course now proposed to it. The step which it was called upon to take was of essential consequence, and it ought to deliberate maturely before it determined to take it. His hon. friend had not made the case quite clear as to what the law now was upon this subject. Many Gentlemen would suppose, from what his hon. friend had said of the tommy system, that no legislative care had hitherto been extended to it. But this was by no means the case. He rested that assertion on a knowledge of what had been done as to the Combination-laws. He asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he had attended to the provisions of the Act for repealing the Combination-laws. That Act had two objects in view, and though they were both useful, his hon. friend had brought up two friends, as staunch as men could be, to give their opinion against the policy and propriety of passing it. One of those two objects was, to provide that no person, be he master or be he man, should be punished for demanding any rate of wages which he thought proper as a remuneration for his labour. The other was, to repeal that part of the law which held, that if three parties determined not to take the rate of wages given to their fellow workmen by their masters, they should be held guilty of a conspiracy. The injustice of such a Statute was so palpable, that he might have obtained the repeal of that part of the law at once, if he had moved for it; but instead of pursuing that course, he had merely asked for a committee of inquiry. That committee was granted — an inquiry was instituted, and after an examination, continued for fifty days, into the operation of the Combination-laws, the bill for the repeal came out of the committee with an unanimous recommendation, that it should forthwith be passed into a law; and pass it did, with less trouble than any bill ever did which, like it, swept off fifty or sixty penal Acts at one fell swoop. That bill did away with the absurd and monstrous clause regarding conspiracy, and provided that both masters and men, if they did not employ threats or violence —of which the employment is punishable at common-law—should be at liberty to demand and make what bargains they pleased, both with respect to the time and amount of their labour, and the wages to be paid for it. Now, the Bill of his learned friend would entirely alter this enactment; and therefore he once more implored the House to pause, and not proceed hastily to abrogate a law, which it had only passed after long and repeated consultations. He was induced to make this prayer to the House, because he wished the workmen of this country to remain in their present situation. He believed that by so doing the House would do much to increase their moral worth and value. If he could satisfy any body of men that they were not mere children, but could make bargains for themselves,—if he could inspire them with a sense of their own independence, by making them feel that they were no longer hampered by Acts of Parliament in the employment of their time, and skill, and industry,—if he could raise the standard by which they were accustomed to estimate themselves, and thus exalt them in the scale of intellectual creatures, he was convinced that he should not only confer a great benefit upon them, but also upon the country in general. He asked the House whether it was prepared to reforge the fetters upon labour, which, much to its credit, it had broke some years ago? The Bill of his hon. friend reforged those fetters by the restrictions which it placed on all future payments for labour. His hon. friend said, that there were no means of enforcing payments for contracts at present. Had his hon. friend forgotten the Act of the 1st of George 4th, passed expressly to enforce contracts? Was it not provided by that Act, that if a contract were made between a master-manufacturer and his workman for work to be performed, and if the work were to be paid for in meal, malt, or any other article, either party might, on the failure of performance by the other, go to a Magistrate and insist on the terms of the contract being obeyed? When there was an Act to that effect, was it not too much to say, that there was no means of enforcing payment of a contract against the master-manufacturers? and was it not absurd to introduce a Bill like the present as an amendment on that Act? He could not help telling the workmen—and he did it with great respect to them, for though they were oppressed formerly they now were free—he could not help telling the workmen, that as the law stood at present the masters were oppressed, and not they. The masters could not make, at present, such bargains as they pleased, but the men could. They were liable to informations if they paid their men in provisions entirely; and in a small town, near Stockport, sixteen informations had been filed against them for acts which they had committed, with the kindest and most charitable intentions to their workmen. He would just give the House a notion of the generality of those informations. A workman had gone to a master-manufacturer and had requested work to prevent his family from starving. The master in reply had told him, that he had no occasion for further hands in his factory, but that, rather than see him and his family starve, he would, if he chose to attend at his work for a certain number of hours in the day, give him a certain quantity of provisions. The workman had gladly accepted this proposal, had performed his work, and had received the promised remuneration. A committee of workmen were sitting in the town, and, on hearing of the circumstance, laid an information against the master-manufacturer; and made the workman, whom he had employed from charitable motives, an unwilling witness against him. The case was heard before Magistrates. The master-manufacturer stated the reason why he had employed the man; the man acknowledged the statement to be correct; admitted that the contract had been fairly performed on both sides, and declared, that it was much against his will that he had been brought forward to support the information. The Magistrates felt the hardship of the case, but said, that under the existing law they had no alternative left but to fine the master-manufacturer 10*l*. for the charity which he had displayed to his unfortunate workman. He (Mr. Hume) contended, that it was a great evil, that if a master gave to any of his workmen a gallon of meal, a sack of potatoes, or a few pounds of meat, he should be liable to a fine of 10*l*. if it were given in part payment of wages. It was a still greater evil, that if this was done a second time, a heavier fine was inflicted. It would be a still greater evil, if the Bill of his hon. friend were passed into law,—for a third commission of this offence would subject the offender to transportation. Was the Chancellor of the Exchequer prepared to give his consent to such a clause? He sincerely hoped not. Again, by his hon. friend's Bill, when an information was lodged against any master, his books were to be laid before the Magistrates as evidence against him. To attempt to do such a thing by legislation, by machinery of this kind, violating, as it did, the privacy which ought to be respected in every mercantile concern, was not only absurd but abominable. [Mr. Littleton informed the hon. Member that he had expunged that part of the Bill.] He confessed that already too much rancour was felt by the men against their masters, and too great a desire to interfere with their contracts with their workmen. Committees were sitting in various towns, for the express purpose of levying fines upon the masters. Would his hon. friend give those committees additional powers of doing mischief? He asked his hon. friend whether, in his communication with the magistracy, he had not often learnt that informations, in which they had no power of mitigating the penalty, were lodged against individuals, whose only offence was their charity? He was unwilling to let the feelings of the House be roused improperly, by exaggerated statements of the evils of the truck-system. Many of those evils arose from the present state of trade, over which no one could exercise any control. The error was, to suppose that the truck-system had occasioned the distress, and not the distress the truck-system. That was exactly the point of dispute between himself and his hon. friend, and therefore it was, that he desired to have an inquiry. He was not aware whether he had made his principles clearly understood, but he felt their correctness himself, and wished to make it felt by others. At the time he proposed the repeal of the Combination-laws, he was told by the masters that he was actuated by a desire to obtain popularity. Was he hunting popularity now? No; he was acting at present, as he did formerly, upon principle. He told the workmen that they were in error, and that their masters were oppressed. They felt the distress, but did not know its origin. His hon. friend, the member for Callington, would tell them, that it was the currency, and would recommend an alteration of it as a nostrum for its remedy. He himself might think it was the Corn-laws, and might recommend the repeal of them as his nostrum. Other Gentlemen might find out other causes, and recommend other nostrums; but no nostrum could be more injurious than one which was applied under complete ignorance, both as to the cause and to the cure of the present distress. He contended, that this measure was equally injurious to the master and the men, and called upon the Vice-President of the Board of Trade to explain how the commerce of the country could be promoted by putting fetters on industry which would eat into its very bones. His hon. friend had said, that the Bill would not come into operation till October next; if that were the case, there was plenty of time for inquiry, and why not grant it? If he could get time during the recess, he would go down to Bolton himself, meet the 20,000 petitioners, and argue this question dispassionately with them. Yes, if the Chancellor of the Exchequer would grant him a committee, he would pledge himself to go down to Bolton, and there argue the question. He knew the good sense of the working classes of this country; the Government was mistaken if it supposed that the manufacturing classes of the country were not, in intelligence, far before it. Yes, the higher classes had been receding for years in information, and during all that time the lower classes had been going forward,—for, to use a common phrase, the schoolmaster had been, indeed, abroad. He would take a committee of sixty manufacturers from Glasgow,—a place with which he was better acquainted than with any part of England,—and he could go into the other House of Parliament, and take a committee of sixty Peers, and he would stake his life that the sixty manufacturers would be found the most sensible by far upon subjects like the present. They might look a long while among the manufacturers before they found one who would talk so much nonsense as a noble Lord talked the other night on that never-to-be-forgotten statement about the distress of the country, particularly with regard to machinery. All, however, that he now asked was, an inquiry. His hon. friend had said, that he wished for more than this, which was true. He did wish for more, but he did not ask for more on the present occasion. If he had the power, he most assuredly would erase from the Statute-book every individual Act which interfered between masters and their men, and leave both to that protection and to those remedies, which the common-law would afford them. His hon. friend had stated it as matter of inconvenience, that if his (Mr. Hume's) views were carried into effect, they must repeal the Hawkers and Pedlars Act; but ought they not to repeal that Act? Was not that Act a disgrace to the age in which we lived? There was much talk now about bringing justice home to every man's door,—which, no doubt, would be a great blessing; but why, in the name of common sense, should they refuse to allow the means of purchasing food and clothing to be brought home to the door of every poor man, who could not afford to go to a distant market? He would have the freest possible communication in commercial affairs, and it was a shame that there should be any tax, either on men or vehicles, by which produce was conveyed from one place to another. He never saw a cart or a stage-coach without thinking so. The less they legislated on matters between master and servant, or on matters of a commercial nature, the better it would be for all parties. The parties who were concerned, the parties who were interested, were of all persons the best qualified to make bargains; and upon this obvious truth he rested the whole of this case. It was from not attending to this fact, it was from shutting our eyes to the truth, that where commercial transactions were left free they always flowed in the best channel, that many of our present difficulties had arisen. The Parliament had in a manner tied the legs of the country, and now it complained because it found that the country was standing still. Among other persons who were at the bottom of this outcry against the truck-system were the retail dealers, and he could very well understand why. It was the interest of retail dealers to get the labourers into their debt. He had seen this at Glasgow, where, because the dealers knew that they could attach the men's wages in the hands of their masters, they were always ready to encourage the labourers to run into debt. What, he would ask, was the difference between this and the system complained of? There was none; for in neither case did any money come into the labourer's pocket. Upon these grounds he called upon the Ministers to have this subject fully and fairly investigated, and, therefore, to support him in the following Motion, which he begged to move as an Amendment to the proposition of his hon. friend. It was this:—"That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire what have been the operation and effect of the Acts prohibiting the payment of wages in goods, or otherwise than in money, and to report the evidence that may be brought before them, as well as their opinion as to the propriety of repealing or amending the said Acts, or of bringing in a new Act on the subject."

Mr. *Sadler* said, that it was his intention to have given a silent vote in favour of the motion of the hon. member for Staffordshire; but after having heard what had fallen from the hon. Member who had just sat down, he thought it his duty to trouble the House with a few observations, in reply to that hon. Gentleman; and his apology for so doing would be, that circumstances had rendered him in some measure acquainted with the evils of which the hon. Member professed himself ignorant. It was somewhat strange that the hon. Member should appeal to Glasgow, where, he acknowledged, the system was not in existence, confessing himself wholly ignorant of its effect where it was in full operation, and still doubt or deny all that had been asserted by those who had long witnessed and deplored the evil, and the representations of scores of thousands of petitioners who were its victims, and who were earnestly imploring the House for redress. The hon. Member had talked of proceeding to Bolton; he wished he would take that course. In the mean time, his ignorance of the nature and extent of the evil was no substantial reason why those who were well acquainted with it, who knew how much misery it inflicted, how wide it had already extended, and that the infection was still spreading, should be prevented from proceeding as became them, namely, in attempting to apply, and instantly, a remedy for so great a grievance. That class of the petitioners whom it was the more immediate object of the Bill to relieve, it was acknowledged on all hands were deeply injured by this system; it deprived them of their fair earnings; varied, at the pleasure of their employers, their wages—in short, it diminished their comforts and degraded their condition. Yet the hon. member for Middlesex had called their meetings for the purpose of obtaining redress, and their numerous petitions to this House, raising a clamour. He would tell him, that any class of society would raise what he called a clamour were they similarly dealt with; namely, if they were defrauded of their honest gains, and after having laboured hard and long, were deprived, under a variety of harassing pretexts, of their due remuneration. But it was somewhat singular to hear the hon. Member talk of the clamour that had been raised, and the ignorance that was to be enlightened on the subject, when he had, almost in the very same breath, assured the House of the supreme intelligence of the very class he had thus stigmatised. But it had been well observed by the hon. Member who had introduced the measure, that the evil deeply affected other classes of society than those who were the principal sufferers, and whom it was the first object of the Bill to relieve. Among them were the tradesmen and retail dealers in the towns where the system prevailed, and whom the honourable member for Middlesex had therefore described as being at the bottom of the outcry, as he called it. It was most evident, that this class were deeply injured, and had a just cause of complaint. The very heavy assessments and taxes, parochial and public, to which their situation rendered them liable, and the unfair competition to which they were therefore subjected, to say nothing of the interest they had at stake, fully justified this numerous and important class of society in having joined with those still more deeply injured, and delivered their remonstrances on this occasion, from the imputation of clamour now cast upon them. While the employers themselves had very generally petitioned the House on the occasion, nay, many of those who had been compelled to adopt, as a matter of necessity, a practice which they greatly object to, were among its most strenuous opponents; as it was clear that those who, while availing themselves of it, were still governed by feelings of honour and humanity, had no chance of competing with those who pursued the same system with more eagerness and less honesty. Thus was it that almost every class was injured by this disgraceful practice wherever it prevailed; and hence that general remonstrance against its continuance which the hon. Member denounced as clamour. But the hon. Member had appealed to the antiquity of the system, which, in his opinion, was a most suspicious argument as applied to the subject. It was true, that 400 years ago the system of barter and truck was pursued—in the then state of things it was impossible that it should have been otherwise; but as society advanced, the practice was still discouraged, and it was too much to state, that we were not to attempt to annihilate a system which was found to be a nuisance even in the earlier times, and which much impeded and long delayed national improvement, but which, in the present state of things, amounted to an intolerable grievance. The hon. Member, however, had appealed to general principles on this occasion. But nothing was more obvious than that abstract principles, dry and barren generalities as they had been called, when applied practically, were often found to be wholly inapplicable, and not unfrequently, indeed, deeply injurious. He thought that the hon. member for Middlesex would find it difficult to apply any known principle which could justify the grievance in question, least of all that of free-trade. In the present state of things, the supply of labour being great, and the demand for it unhappily otherwise, it was obvious that the master and the workman did not meet upon equal terms; the latter was in the power of the former, and the idea of making a bargain regarding wages, on the same footing, was a farce. The freedom was all on one side—a freedom not only to bring down the wages of labour to the lowest possible scale consistent with the scantiest means of subsistence, and not unfrequently below that; but again to diminish at pleasure the value of those very wages, inadequate as they might be, leaving to the industrious man an alternative indeed, that of a total loss of employment, which consigned him at once to misery and pauperism. And was it thus that the principle of free trade was to be applied? He had been supposed to have been somewhat hostile to the general application of that principle under existing circumstances; but in all he had advanced upon the subject, he had never carried his hostility to it so far as to identify it with a system which practically placed the workman in the power of his employer, giving the freedom of oppression without hope and without redress. But the view the hon. Member took was a fallacious application of his own principles. He had spoken much and long upon the circulating medium of the country; he was strenuously in favour of the regulation which compelled the public to discharge in gold a debt which had been contracted in their name in paper; the consequences were sufficiently known and felt, especially as respected the lower and industrious classes. But it appeared to the hon. Member to be right upon "principle." He therefore interdicted that contracts should be any longer made or satisfied in a paper medium, at least below a certain amount: he thought it right upon principle that every 20*l.* for instance, that should be paid to the public creditor, no matter the difficulty and distress it involved, should be no longer discharged in the medium in which it was contracted. But the hon. Member varied his principle when he applied it to the lower and labouring classes; their 20*s.*, the hard-earned product of a week's, or a fortnight's labour, was not to be secured to them in the precious metals; no, nor yet in paper, but in twenty pounds, it might be, of rancid bacon; in short, in any commodity, of any quality, and at any price, which the employer might choose to render him. How did this comport with the hon. Member's notions as to the currency? He thought that it was unnecessary to protect that which was paid to the poor, though we were to run the risk of ruining the empire, in securing, reforming, and raising, the value of that which was demanded by the capitalists of the country. The hon. Member had said something about the necessity of allowing the master and workman to fix upon the wages to be given and received. But the principle he defended necessarily unfixed them. The standard of value, of which so much had been said, is in this case the standard which the former pleased to use for the occasion; and the consequences were obvious, verified by the allegations of tens of thousands, whose wrongs had been made known to the House by the petitions which loaded its Table. But the hon. Member had attempted, though most unsuccessfully, to reconcile his views upon this subject with the interests of the lower classes, in stating that if the truck-system were abolished, 50,000 or 100,000 persons would probably be thrown out of employment. Employment followed demand; and how could the hon. Member suppose that demand for any manufactured article was created here, or in any of the continental markets, by the circumstance that the wages of the labour of those who fabricated the articles demanded were thus disgracefully paid, that is, in adulterated flour, decayed bacon, or any other commodity, save money?—The idea was ridiculous. But the hon. Member seemed to think, that the system supplied the employer with capital and credit; here again he was as much in error, for if he could obtain goods upon credit, he could borrow money also wherewith to pay his workmen. Did he attempt to satisfy any other of the demands upon him in the same manner as those of his workmen,—demands often to a much heavier amount? This idea was also too absurd to entertain. He would leave, however, the principle of the hon. Member, and its application, to himself, and advert in conclusion to that of the law of this country, which had ever regarded the wages of labour with peculiar favour, and indeed, given the claims they created, a preference over all other and ordinary demands. Indeed, every institution, sacred or civil, as far as he knew, had thus regarded them. The pittance which laborious poverty earns, is its only wealth, its sole capital, and it deeply behoved the House to protect and guard it from the grasp of rapaciousness, and the attempts, however, disguised and palliated, of practical oppression. But it had been said, that the law, if passed would be evaded; let it be so. Most of our laws are partially evaded; and amongst them many which nevertheless are, on the whole, generally operative and highly beneficial; let this be one of them. Even if the nuisance which has accumulated so greatly, cannot be wholly abated, let an attempt at least be made, which the principles of justice and humanity equally demand. At least place on the Statute-book the strongest inhibition of this nefarious practice, subject the offender to adequate penalties, and if he still evade the law, brand him with the stigma of breaking the laws of his country, with those of justice and humanity. He hardly thought it necessary to notice the assertion, that the labourer might refuse to receive his wages in the commodities delivered to him. That was true; but then, in that case, it was clear, if he demanded money instead, it would from such employers be the last he would receive. He would give an instance. It was not a peculiar, but, unhappily, a common case, in which it appeared that a workman had forced upon him for his week's wages a certain weight of cheese scarcely fit for use, and which he had to sell to the very employer from whom he received it, and at his own terms, namely, little more than one-half the price he had been compelled to pay for it. Why should any one be compelled to suffer such a diminution of the recompense of his hard labour; and why should the master, who had already made one profit upon his labour, be empowered to turn round upon him and make another and a still more profitable bargain with him, exacting an unjust and usurious gain upon the very wages of his labour? He repeated, that the evil was one of great magnitude, and that no time ought to be lost in dealing with it as it deserved. It was the first and most important duty of the Legislature to protect the poor, inasmuch as the rich are in a great measure able to protect themselves; but he was compelled to confess, that its chief care and labour had been latterly devoted to give security to capital, and facilities to the accumulation of wealth. "If (concluded the hon. Member) the measure should fail in producing all the good the benevolent purpose of it anticipates, still it cannot fail of accomplishing much in convincing the suffering people that this House commiserates the distresses, and is anxious to redress the injuries, of the poor. It will, therefore greatly soothe their irritation, if it should not wholly relieve their sufferings. It will, together with other measures which may be adopted, hold out a prospect, at least, that their condition will be, at length, improved; and open upon them that ray of hope which may brighten into future prosperity and happiness. In the mean time, whether in relation to the nature of the injury complained of, the multitude of those seeking redress, or the period in which their complaints are uttered, it becomes the House to proceed with this measure, and without delay."

Mr. *George Robinson* said, that he felt it his duty, regardless of the misrepresentation to which he might subject himself, to state his opinion upon this important topic. He had not heard any one contend that it was better that the labourer should be paid in goods than in money. If they were called upon at once to decide whether the labourer should be paid in goods, or in money, there could be no difference of opinion. But that was not the question before the House. Two propositions had been submitted to it. The one for leave to bring in a Bill at once to abolish the evil complained of: the other for the appointment of a Select Committee, to inquire and report their opinion on the circumstances of the case. Such being the alternative; the latter proposition was decidedly that which should receive his support. He believed the truck-system was very prejudicial to the labourers and to the retail dealers throughout the country. Last year he was not aware that it existed in the city which he had the honour to represent. He had since found that it did so exist, and that there was a strong feeling against it; and he had been emphatically called upon by his constituents to assist in its abolition. Under these circumstances, he rose, not to oppose the Bill moved for by the hon. member for Staffordshire, but merely to call the attention of the House to the calm and dispassionate consideration of which of the two propositions before them was entitled to the preference. Let not the House deceive itself by supposing, that to put an end to the truck-system would be to put an end to the existing evils in the country. The truck-system was rather the effect than the cause of those evils. Those evils, as the hon. member for Middlesex had justly observed, arose out of a complication of causes. If he thought that the Bill moved for by the hon. member for Staffordshire would immediately produce the effect of paying the labouring classes in money, and thereby producing a better position of things, no man would more cordially and willingly support the measure. Indeed, he did not by any means now oppose the bringing in of the Bill. If the House determined to allow the hon. Member to bring it in, he (Mr. Robinson) would not only not oppose its progress, but would give his humble assistance in rendering it as perfect an instrument as possible for carrying into effect the benevolent views of its author. But what he was particularly anxious to impress upon the House was, that the evils under which the manufacturing districts were at present suffering, were not to be remedied by any one act of Legislation. If the Bill should be carried, it would have the effect of producing a diminution of the demand for labour, and it was from the want of that demand that so much misery now existed. It would have, he was also afraid, a most injurious effect, it would promote disputes and endless litigation, and quarrels between masters and their workmen. He admitted that the man who was obliged to take bad goods, or goods which he did not want, must do it under the operation of some power of compulsion; but, on the other hand, what compulsion was it that obliged him to take those goods except that of the want of employment, which existed independently of this system? He feared that this Bill would not remove that cause. The subject was one of the greatest difficulty—and the only course that remained for them to pursue was, to adopt a calm and temperate inquiry, and though that inquiry might require time, they ought to devote that time to so important a subject. He should, therefore, support Mr. Hume's Amendment for a Select Committee of Inquiry; but if the House should agree to the measure proposed by Mr. Littleton, and after the discussion they had had on this subject, should be of opinion that it might be adopted without a Committee of Inquiry, he would then do his best to perfect the details of the measure.

Mr. *Hyde Villiers* was glad that this discussion had taken place, and was glad that so many hon. Members attended it, for he believed it would go far to quiet the irritation among the labouring classes when they found that this subject, so immediately relating to them had been so much and so carefully canvassed by that House. He had most attentively read the reports that had been made by the committees on the Combination-laws respecting the state and condition of masters and men. Those reports undoubtedly contained much very valuable information, but still they were not sufficient for him, or for any of those hon. Members who, like him, had no personal experience in these matters, to make up their minds on this most important subject. Even from the arguments of those who supported the measure introduced by the hon. member for Staffordshire, he could not find any such high degree of information upon the details of the subject, as to afford any good reason for rejecting the amendment of the hon. member for Middlesex: he really did not think they had made a sufficiently clear case for granting the Motion without a Committee of Inquiry. He begged the House to recollect that this was a most important measure—that it must have an undefined effect on the great interests of the country—and that, if they legislated without inquiry, they might find that they had involved themselves in considerable difficulties. Every one agreed, that in common cases no persons should pretend to prescribe a remedy for any evil with the nature of which he was not thoroughly acquainted. Yet, in this instance, so far were all men from having agreed upon the nature of the evil to be remedied, that no two men held the same opinions upon it. Some supposed that the whole system was forced upon the men by the power of the masters; others doubted that fact, and believed it was a system adopted for the convenience of both. Now it seemed to him most probable that the latter opinion was correct. If one agreed to pay, and the other to receive, wages in goods, there could be no injustice in such an agreement; and this Bill was not required for such a case; if an agreement was made for money, and after the work had been performed, the master insisted on paying in truck, there would be a manifest injustice in such a case; and if this Bill was meant to provide against that injustice, then it became a bill for the better securing the performance of contracts. The House ought surely to know what was the subject, and the exact nature of the measure; but without inquiry it was impossible for the House to be informed on the subject. He believed that the truck-system was founded on the mutual and voluntary consent of the master and workmen, for otherwise, he could not understand how it was that the system had been so long and so extensively adopted. Even the hon. Member who introduced the bill admitted that it had existed in times when distress was not generally or severely felt, and that admission was sufficient to show that its adoption had been a matter of preference. That it was adopted for the advantage of both parties, was proved by the fact that the men who (since the repeal of the Combination-laws) might legally combine for any purpose of their own, and who had, in fact, combined upon several other questions, had never once thought of entering into a combination on the subject of this system. It appeared to him that this measure was not one of mere regulation of contracts, but that it involved the immensely-important principle of regulating the rate of wages; and he must repeat, that any principle of so great and extended an operation ought not to be adopted without inquiry. He thought it would be a strong measure for any one to propose that that House should say to the masters throughout the country, "You shall not give less than a certain rate of wages," and to the labourers, "You shall not receive less than a certain rate of wages;" and perhaps there were few, if any, who would be found to propose such a measure; but he must say, that, in principle, a bill which said to the masters "You shall not pay," and to the workmen "You shall not receive wages in truck," differed little from a measure of the sort to which he had alluded. No one in that House would like to be told that he must keep his servants on board wages? yet a declaration similar in principle was made by this bill to every master in the kingdom. He did not mean to deny that there had been cases of gross occasional abuse under this system; but no man of judgment would say, that a system ought to be abolished because there were cases of abuse under it; nor did any man at present know, with any degree of certainty, whether the abuses under the system had been of great extent or not. He must say one word with respect to the petitions on this subject. How was it that when so many individuals, and so many classes of individuals, must feel a deep interest in the continuance of the truck-system, no petitions had been presented in its favour, though so many had been laid on the table against it? That was one of the matters into which he wished to inquire. He supposed that it would be asserted by some hon. gentleman that the truck-system enabled the masters to effect a greater reduction of wages than they would be able to effect if the labourer was paid in money. It might be said, too, that this was the cause of the great number of the opponents of the present system, for that the labourer would be more sensibly made to feel the reduction in the scale of the comforts of life, and that he would naturally struggle against his own degradation. That opinion might be well founded, but he could not venture to legislate on mere speculative opinion; he therefore required a Committee of Inquiry, without which he should not be satisfied to proceed. It was found, he believed, that though the system worked well in some places, it might have a contrary tendency in others; but how was the House to know that without inquiry—or how could they ascertain whether the evils of the system were such as to call on them to get rid of it—or that, if they did get rid of it, they might not introduce a greater evil in its place? He called, therefore, for an inquiry into the moral and physical condition of those who were under the influence of this system. There were, upon the present question, distinct issues on matters of fact, that could only be well tried before a Select Committee of that House. He had two distinct objects of inquiry, on which he wished for the best information. The first was, whether the system now existing was spontaneously adopted by the mutual consent of both masters and men, or whether it had been forced upon the latter by the pressure of distress? The second, whether the advantages of the system were not greater than anything they could hope to obtain in attempting to suppress it? and to these two points might be added a third; namely, in what manner the change from the present system was to be best effected, if the making of that change should be found to be matter of necessity? With respect to the motives of the hon. Member who introduced the measure, there could be no doubt that they were of the best and most honourable kind; and the ability with which he supported his proposition was worthy of his zeal for the object he had in view. With these feelings towards the hon. Member, he need hardly say, that if he felt himself possessed of full information upon the subject, and if that information induced him to think that the truck-system ought to be abolished, he would most willingly give his support to the present bill. But he was so impressed with the importance of the measure, that even if it had originated with the Government, and had been brought forward as a cabinet measure, after inquiry by them, he felt he could not consent to adopt it without an inquiry by a committee of that House. Having said thus much, he should have sat down had it not been for the remarks which had fallen last night from a right hon. Baronet (Sir R. Peel) opposite. That right hon. baronet had warned the House to take care how it allowed the state of the manufacturing labourers to fall into the same condition as the agriculturist in the southern agricultural counties. He admitted the propriety of the warning, but after paying, as he was bound to do, much attention to the subject, he had come to the conclusion that the explanation which the right hon. Baronet had given of the causes of the distress was quite incorrect. When such different opinions prevailed as to a fact which might be supposed to lie near the surface, he thought the House ought to be very cautious in its proceeding. On this part of the subject he wished to make one observation: he believed that many of the evils now felt by the people arose from the imperfect legislation of that House on matters of general interest. When any particular evil existed, individuals were allowed to bring in measures which they believed to be likely to prove remedies to those evils, but which, being introduced without sufficient previous inquiry, and being intended to meet a particular contingency, often produced an injurious effect on the general interests of the country. There was not a Session passed in which they had not some meddling with the Poor-laws. The present Session had scarcely commenced when five new laws were introduced. The consequence of this was, that they were worse off than if they had no laws at all. When were they to put an end to that species of petty and vexatious legislation? He thought the present was particularly a case in which they ought not to indulge their private or individual feelings, but allow the thing fairly to go to a committee.

Mr. *D. Gilbert* said, that viewing all the circumstances of the case, he thought the Bill, with proper modifications (for he would not pledge himself to approve of the whole of its provisions) ought to receive his support. Some provisions ought to be introduced with respect to the mining districts, which were peculiarly situated. Every person who knew any thing of mining must be aware, that workmen engaged in the mines could not be hired in the ordinary manner that labourers were. He thought, however, that no manager, or captain of a mine, should be allowed to keep a shop; because, though he might say to the workman, "You are free to deal where you please," still, if the individual did not deal with him, he would have the power of discharging him, on any pretence, from the mine.

Lord *Althorp* said, he was undoubtedly at first more inclined to support the Amendment than the bill. But, having heard the Gentlemen who came forward, and described the state of the country, their observations had materially altered his opinion, and he could not help viewing the proposition of the hon. member for Middlesex as one of an extremely doubtful character. They were now placed in this situation, that they must either repeal all the laws relating to the truck-system, or they must render them perfectly efficient. Such was the alternative presented to them, and it was for the House to decide as to which course was the more eligible. A good deal had been said as to the character of the bill that was intended to be brought in, by Gentlemen who were not acquainted with its provisions. He, however, had seen the bill, which they had not, and therefore he could speak of it with confidence. Those Gentlemen appeared to be arguing with reference to a bill which was formerly before Parliament, whereas, the present bill, though its object was the same, proposed to obtain that object by different means. In one point, this bill possessed a very great advantage over the bill of last year. This bill provided for the repeal of all the former Acts; and all the regulations with respect to the payment of wages in truck, contained in it, were clearly and specifically expressed. Some provisions of a harsh nature with respect to that point, which were in the measure of last year, were excluded from this. Therefore the arguments used were not, in fact, applicable to the bill then before the House. The question now under discussion was, whether, before Gentlemen saw this measure, they would insist on having an inquiry, and afterwards decide whether the bill should be adopted under all the circumstances which might be brought to light. He confessed that he disapproved of that course. The hon. member for Middlesex, in his very able and eloquent speech, inveighed against any interference with the wages of labour. That argument, in the truth of which he entirely concurred, was advanced by the hon. Member in a most unanswerable manner. But then the foundation of that argument was, that the transaction between the master and the labourer was free. Now the fact, on the contrary, was, that it was not free. The labourer, under this system, got in debt to his master, and he was no longer a free agent, and that master could force him to the adoption of that or any other practice which he pleased. The hon. Member said, that the labourer might get in debt with money as well as with goods. That was true, but not to the full extent which the hon. Member had asserted. The right hon. Baronet opposite last night pointed out how exceedingly important it was to prevent the manufacturing population from imbibing those feelings which at present showed themselves in many of the agricultural districts. In that sentiment he entirely concurred; and, when he found the manufacturing districts petitioning, day after day, for the abolition of this system, he thought that it would be unwise and imprudent to refuse their request, or to postpone this bill until a committee of inquiry had finished its labours. When his right hon. friend near him, and other hon. Gentlemen, who were advocates for free trade, admitted the necessity of adopting a measure of this kind, it must be at once inferred, that an overwhelming cause led them to take that course. He had seen the measure, and would support its principle, but he did not pledge himself to approve of all its details. There were some districts to which, perhaps, it would not be applicable, and where it was necessary to proceed on another principle. When, however, the bill went into a committee, and was altered and amended, he thought that it ought to be adopted by the House.

Sir *R. Peel* said, he meant to support the bill of the hon. member for Staffordshire; but in no stage of it would he consent to a Committee of Inquiry. The bill was, perhaps, opposed to the rigid rules of political economy. The rules of that science had reference to the production of wealth in a nation, but he must inquire what effect the application of them, in a given case, was likely to have on the morals of a country. Now, if it were shown to him that the application of those rules added to the stock of wealth, but tended, at the same time, to the destruction of morals amongst the people, he certainly, to preserve those morals pure, would overlook and throw aside the principles of political economy. They had established, amongst the greatest improvements in science, a standard of money, by which the value of different commodities was to be obtained, Now, the only commodity over which the poor man had any command was his labour. That being the case, then, he had a right to inquire, whether, in giving up that labour, the bargain made with the poor man was a free, just, and equitable one. Supposing that the transaction was not a fair one on the part of the master, he would ask, where was the poor man's remedy? If the poor man were to be paid in money, then it was easy for the Magistrate to decide, if a complaint were made to him. If the poor man had stipulated for 2*s.* and got only 1*s.* 6*d.*, it was evident that the Magistrate could grant redress. But if the labourer agreed to take a certain quantity of goods for his debt, in that case he had no legal remedy by which he could recover the price of his labour, because it then became a question of quality, and not merely of quantity. If the quality be deteriorated, and the quantity was not curtailed, there was no mode by which the poor man could legally enforce justice. On these few, simple, and tangible grounds, he should vote for the bill of the hon. member for Staffordshire. He was favourable to the payment of wages in money, because it encouraged feelings of sobriety and independence. He wished the poor man to have an opportunity of laying by a little money for old age, as a portion for a daughter, or a provision for his widow. This could not be done where the truck-system prevailed, and men were paid, not in money, but with bad butter, or bad cheese, which they were obliged to sell at a ruinous loss.

Mr. *H. Gurney* said, that he was one of those who had opposed the former bill, and from all he had since heard, it appeared to him, that if ever there was a bill which should have been sent for consideration to a Select Committee, this was one. There was a great difference of opinion, not only on the facts, but on the principles of the measure, and it was very desirable that the subject should be fully investigated. If the noble Lord opposite, however, took the bill under his protection, he had only to say, that he hoped the bill would receive that examination from the Government which he conceived it ought to receive from a Select Committee.

Mr. *Attwood* commenced by observing, that he agreed with those who conceived, that great ills had arisen from the application of partial remedies and inefficient legislative enactments. He deprecated the measure about to be introduced, because it partook of that character. The House was, in fact, again about to legislate without referring to the real circumstance, in which the evil to be remedied originated, and without adequate knowledge of the causes of the calamities, against the recurrence of which it was sought to provide. It was with pain he addressed the House on the subject, but he was satisfied, after considering all the statements, distressing as they were of his hon. friend the member for Staffordshire, and great as he admitted the evils thus described to be, that the proposed measure was not a proper remedy. If the hon. member for Staffordshire (Mr. Littleton) should be able to suppress the truck-system by his Bill—an object which he did not think the Bill would accomplish—the effect would only be, to involve those whom he wished to serve in greater calamities than those they suffered under the system he desired to abrogate. The hon. Member had referred to numerous details, showing the degree in which workmen, paid their wages by truck, suffered from the operation of that system. The House could not be better occupied than in examining into details, however minute, which explained the condition of large bodies of the people, at a time like the present; and particularly when the House was about to legislate with a view of providing a remedy for urgent and severe distress. It appeared from the details thus brought before the House, that the labourer in many instances only received a nominal reward. That he took in payment for his labour an article for 8*d*. which was worth only 4*d*., for 6*d*. which was worth but 3*d*. This was a most important fact, but the question to which it gave rise was, why is it? Why did the labourer submit to so delusive a system? Why did he not leave the master who defrauded him, and seek for one who would pay his wages in goods at their fair value, or in money? This question brought the whole subject at once under consideration. It was clear that there was a surplus of labour; that trade was depressed, and that the sufferings of these workmen had their origin in the ruinous condition of the manufacture in which they were engaged. The wrong they suffered from an abuse of the truck-system was an evidence of their distress, but was not the cause of it; nor would their sufferings be removed by any measure, short of one which should restore the general prosperity of their trade. To make out his case completely, the hon. member for Staffordshire ought to have gone further; he ought to have learnt what was the condition of other bodies of workmen, where the truck-system does not prevail; and have shewn whether it was better than the deplorable state of workmen paid by truck. This task he (Mr. Attwood) would discharge. He would refer to the condition of labourers in the same branch of manufacture as that which the member for Staffordshire had chiefly cited, the iron manufacture; but amongst whom payment by truck did not prevail. On the 18th of March last, a petition was presented to the House from the iron-masters of Merthyr Tidvil, in the county of Glamorgan. That petition stated, that those who signed it employed about 7,500 effective workmen; a population, therefore, of perhaps 30,000 or 40,000 souls were dependant on their industry; and the petitioners asserted, that these workmen were paid entirely in money. Within about a week of the delivery of this petition, another was presented from the inhabitants of the town of Merthyr Tidvil, a town containing, he believed, about 30,000 inhabitants, composed almost wholly of labourers in the adjacent iron works, and of persons dependant on the iron manufacture. It is there affirmed that the inhabitants suffer "grievous oppression and misery—that they have been gradually sinking deeper and deeper in distress and misery, until at last the greatest part of the population are now resigning themselves to hopelessness and despair; and that there are thousands of families in that town, who are the very pictures of distress and famine." If the truck-system were to be charged with the sufferings of the Staffordshire labourers, what was it then which exposed to famine the Merthyr Tidvil workmen? But it might perhaps be said, that though truck did not exist amongst these men, yet its existence in the same trade, and in the same neighbourhood also, was capable of having affected these labourers in an indirect manner, if not directly. It could do so in one way only, the employers of these men, surrounded by truck on all sides, might by its aid unduly lower money wages. Whether that were the fact or not would be seen by referring again to the first petition; that of the iron masters themselves. There it appeared that the employers were as greatly distressed as their workmen. "The price at which iron sells," say the masters, "is so low that it does not reimburse us even the amount of the miserable wages we pay for labour; leaving nothing for royalties—royalties being in the iron-trade the cost of the raw material; nothing for the raw material, nothing for capital, and nothing for bad debts." Here then lay the true difficulty with which the House must grapple, if they desired that their endeavours to relieve the labourers should not be mistaken and useless. Low prices they must abolish, and not the truck-system. Raise the prices of the productions of labour to a remunerative level, and then the labourer would be fed. Was distress amongst the labouring population, confined to any particular trade or district? Universally it prevailed, and everywhere from the same cause. Was it not the want of a remunerative price which plunged the agricultural labourer and the farmer in one common ruin; and was felt alike on all productive industry; but whilst the want of remunerative prices for the productions of industry was spreading ruin over the country, how had that House itself been employed? In passing acts to raise the value of money. But laws which raise the value of money, are laws which lower the prices of productions; laws to produce precisely the evils under which the nation suffers. The last Act of this description was the Act of 1826, which abolished a paper, and substituted a good money, abolished a money of a lesser, and substituted one of a higher value. It is from that period, let the House observe, that the petitioners date their calamities, the hon. member for Staffordshire himself asserted a corresponding fact. In 1824, and in 1825, said he, there was no distress in the iron-trade; the masters were prosperous, and the workmen all employed at good wages. And what say the petitioners of Merthyr Tidvil. "It is for the last four years say they, that we have been gradually sinking deeper and deeper in distress," cause and effect then were plainly before them. They had their own measures to deal with: the money system established by themselves, and not the truck-system resorted to by the traders, must be revised, if they desired to save the perishing labourer. But the money system, said the noble Lord at the head of the Exchequer, must remain untouched. Errors had been committed. The great and fearful system as it now stands must be perpetual, whatever be the consequences, and under no circumstances must that system be again considered or revised. Let it then be so. But he would tell the noble Lord, that so acting, there remained one other course, which, rugged though it was, and dangerous, he would yet find himself compelled to travel. If he would take no measures for raising the prices of productions, he would be driven to take measures for reducing the cost of production. He must lessen the taxes. Not on any scale such as he dreamed of; not on any scale adapted with reference to the necessities of the Government; but adapted to the necessities of the people. Taxes must be reduced to such an extent as, in the language of the petition he had quoted before, would effectually relieve the people from their grievous misery and oppression. To reconcile such an effectual reduction of the taxes with the security of public faith, and the preservation of existing establishments, was the task which the noble Lord had prepared for himself; but he could tell the noble Lord; that if, abstaining from such reduction, he should be able to succeed long in wringing the present amount of annual taxation from the country, in money and in prices of the present value, the productive industry of the country would give way, and would sink under the burthen thus imposed. The system of paying wages by truck, as adopted in the iron-districts, and the abuse of that system, had been, in fact, mainly in consequence of the laws for changing the currency. He would endeavour to explain the operation. Money had been rendered by law, less in quantity, and higher in value. No man now denied that. Then of necessity followed a general fall of prices, and a general reduction of wages. But what was the process by which alone wages could be reduced? By no other means could wages be reduced, but by an alteration effected in the proportion between the demand for labour and its supply—by an over supply of labour. The same principle governed wages in the iron-trade, and in all other branches of industry. He recollected the answer given by a farmer to a committee of that House. Having stated that if prices fell wages must fall; and being asked, "Are the wages of labour easily reduced?" his answer was, "No. It is a very difficult thing to get down the wages of labour. The only way is, for the master, where he employed five men, to employ only four: let him discharge one out of five, and he would soon pull down the wages of the workmen." Thus it was that a general reduction of the wages of labour, enforced by whatever means, legislative or otherwise, was attended with consequences more dangerous, calamitous, and extensive, than perhaps any other evil to which a great manufacturing, commercial, and agricultural people could be subjected. Want of employment, an excess of labour, a redundant population, general and universal distress, crime and misery, were necessary concomitants. The truck-system had been, in fact, resorted to in the iron-trade, as a means of escaping from calamities, as an alleviation of difficulties, which the Legislature, by changes in the value of money, had imposed. The manufacturer had been placed under the necessity of reducing the wages of his men; but the wages of labour were governed by the demand for labour. The manufacturer of iron was unable to reduce his demand for labour, without first suspending his works and machinery, and that was ruin to the manufacturer. As long as the workman saw the usual revolutions of the wheels, heard the blast of the furnace, and the stroke on the anvil, he knew that his labour was as usual required. So circumstanced, he would submit to no reduction in the price of labour, whatever might be the necessities of his employer. Wages could not be reduced, therefore, till work should be suspended. Surplus labour would then be thrown on the market, and wages would fall. But the master-manufacturer would not abandon his works, whilst able to carry them on on any terms. That had been asserted by his hon. friend the member for Staffordshire; and he was glad to hear from such a quarter that avowal. That hon. Gentleman, or at least the school whose doctrines he espoused, had hitherto maintained an opposite opinion. The House had been repeatedly told by them, that traders ought not to be believed, when they represented that they carried on their operations with loss. It was contrary to the very nature of trade, said the political economists, for traders so to act. With that assertion the House had been called on to repel the complaints of the ship-owners, ship-builders, of silk-manufacturers, of the iron-masters, and of men engaged in other branches of distinctive industry. Now, however, it was admitted, that the iron-trade at least had long been carried on with loss. The truth was, that men whose capital was embarked in an unprofitable manufacture, were generally unable to abandon that manufacture, without abandoning also all they possessed of value—their fortune, and the advantages of their experience. So situated, they would proceed, in the hope of rendering that ruin doubtful, which, by not proceeding, would be made certain; they would cling to the last remains of a capital which they could not withdraw, until bankruptcy, the greatest calamity, as it had been truly called by Adam Smith, to which a trader could be subject, closed their exertions. But as long as the usual number of works continued in operation, wages would not fall. High wages and low prices effected a rapid exhaustion of capital. Those manufacturers whose capital was the slenderest would be first ruined. Their works suspended, their labourers thrown out of employment, then pressed down the market of labour, and so wages would fall. Such had been the precise process which, twice repeated in recent experience, (and for the accuracy of its description he appealed to hon. friends of his who sat near, engaged in that branch of trade) had adjusted the wages of labour to a reduced price of iron; reduced by legislative changes then, as now, in the value of money. Numerous bankruptcies amongst the manufacturers had preceded the fall of wages. But the last reduction in the price of iron, the fall which commenced four years since, had not been accompanied by bankruptcies, and yet wages had been reduced. This was owing to the truck-system, which afforded a mitigated form of lowering the remuneration of labour. Reduced remuneration was in that shape more readily submitted to by the workman; but chiefly it was, that by payment in goods the manufacturer supplied the exhaustion of his capital. The hon. member for Staffordshire had himself, in other words, asserted that fact, when he said that the goods which the truck-master paid for wages were purchased by him at a credit of three or six months; that is, the truck-master was not called on to pay for the goods, till three months or six months after he had disbursed them in wages to his men. Wages were paid weekly; the payment day arrives; you require that payment shall be made to the workman in gold money. But suppose the case of a manufacturer who is unable longer to procure gold money. The 1*l.* note, which he could have more easily procured, a previous Act of the Legislature has abolished. The banker will not advance gold on terms so facile, either as to credit or price, as those on which he would have advanced paper. The trader would be at once ruined, if the truck-system did not come to his aid. By purchasing goods, and paying goods as wages, he postpones for six months any demand on himself. His capital was wasting, but his credit remained, and by this device he found the means of struggling a little longer with ruin. Such were the real facts of the case, and the passing of this Act would be a statute of bankruptcy, against not a small proportion of traders in different branches of manufacture, now contending with difficulties which that House itself had imposed. In paper, had the House said, you shall not pay. Gold the trader found it out of his power to procure; and now the House was called on to inflict on him the penalty of bankruptcy, as a punishment for his inability. But why, it might be asked, if such be the situation of any considerable body of traders, is not their case stated in petitions. Traders were a body not prone to proclaim their sufferings; but it was not the less certain that the House, by passing this Bill, would drive a numerous class of traders to hopeless bankruptcy. He knew well the condition of many of those persons; and knew also, that he, whilst he was advocating their cause, was inflicting a deep wound on their feelings; and he told the House they had no right to crush men so circumstanced. In conclusion, he again repeated, in reference to the assertion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that the sufferings of the labourers would receive no alleviation from any such expedients as the abolishing the truck-system. The want of a remunerative price for productions it was which involved the labourer and his employer in common difficulties, throughout all branches of industry. If, with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, they refused all relief by measures which might establish higher prices, no other course was open, but to lower the cost of the productions of industry, by an effectual and great reduction of taxation.

Mr. *Poulett Thomson* said, that, even if he agreed with the hon. Member who just sat down, that the mode of paying wages by the truck-system had been introduced as a substitute for paper money, that would be an additional argument in his mind for supporting the present measure. Until the House decided that another system of currency should be established, they ought to adhere to that which existed. Bad as the paper system was, it was better than a currency of cheese and butter, and other matters of that description. He agreed with those Members who said, that the truck-system was an indirect mode of diminishing wages; but he went further, for he said, it was an unjust and undue mode of diminishing wages. In giving his support to this measure, he considered he was violating no principle. The principle which he always advocated was, that they should confer the greatest possible benefit on the people for whom they had to legislate. With regard to the principles of political economy, he advocated them because they served as a fixed line to guide him, but he had never asserted that they were to approach that line under all circumstances, and at all times. He owned he was not so sanguine as some of his hon. friends as to the benefits to be expected from this measure. It was a difficult subject, but, after all the consideration he could give it, he believed the measure would be beneficial to the great mass of the manufacturing population. It had been said, in the course of the Debate, that the truck-system had grown up because it was pleasing to the labourers. That might have been the case, in the first instance, but subsequently, no doubt, the practice had been greatly abused. No one could doubt that, under the system as it now existed, it was out of the power of the labouring man to secure the performance of the contract into which he proposed to enter, and might think he had concluded. When he was told that it was better to leave the labourer in perfect freedom to enter into what contract he pleased, he adopted the principle; but he asked, whether the labourer had perfect freedom and power to enforce the contract? The poor labourer was bound, by the law of settlement, by the difficulty of removal, by the ties of kindred and affection—and, above all, he was bound by the combination amongst the masters. Then, what was the inconvenience that would result from this measure? they would enable the labourer to avoid exchanging his labour for a deceptive commodity. He could then exchange it for that which was exchangeable for every thing he required. The bill secured to him what was of value, and what he knew the value of. Its tendency, therefore, was, in that point of view, to preserve the labourer from the consequences of his own imprudence and ignorance. Such a principle of legislation, he contended, was not unjust. The hon. member for Middlesex objected to the details of a bill not actually before the House, and of which he could know nothing. He objected, that the bill would destroy the advantage arising from competition, and would give a monopoly to the large manufacturers; it would prevent, too, the hon. Member thought, the masters from selling cheaper to their workmen than retail dealers, as they now did in many instances. That objection, however, fell to the ground. The bill did not prevent the master from keeping a shop, and selling to the labourers for money, but prevented him from paying their labour in goods, without first paying for it in money. Another objection was, that the bill would be attended with inconvenience where the truck-system did not prevail. Now, the fact was, that the bill would not be called into operation unless the evil it was intended to remedy was felt by the Magistrate. There was no use in going through the details of a bill which had not yet been introduced; but he was anxious to state, that he gave his support to the measure, because he felt that it was calculated to prevent fraud, and protect the poor and ignorant.

The *Attorney General* said, that representing a very populous and manufacturing town, he was desirous of saying a few words on this subject, especially as a petition had been presented from the town which he represented, signed by 8,000 workmen, and upwards of 100 masters, against the system. It was a remarkable fact, that all the parties concerned in the traffic were favourable to this bill, and he, therefore, thought, that they ought to grant it to them, although he must confess that he did not feel sure of the soundness of the principle on which it was proposed. At the same time he must observe, that he had so much confidence in the spread of knowledge among the manufacturers and artizans of those districts, as not to be afraid of the refusal of this measure causing any rising or disturbance among them. But when he found all parties thus anxious to have the measure conceded to them, he would confess that he had not the courage to set up his own individual opinion against the demand of all those who were most interested in the subject. He had no doubt of the justice of the proposition, that both masters and men should be at liberty to regulate their own concerns, and perhaps it was for this very reason that the measure ought to be granted, since it was an Act which both parties concurred in asking for. ["*Question.*"]

Mr. *Hume* said, that if the House was impatient, perhaps it would be better to adjourn the Debate.

Mr. *Tennant* complained, that the rule which the bill of the hon. member for Staffordshire required them to lay down was not that of allowing men to make the best bargains for themselves; on the contrary, its principle was, to put men in a state of destitution, and so take it out of their power to form any contract at all. If this interference between the master and the labourer was suffered, he did not know what might be the consequence. The thing of which he chiefly complained was, that this measure was unphilosophical and unstatesmanlike; for its object was beyond the power of man to accomplish. It was a bill which would most certainly be evaded; because the higher rights of self-protection would always interfere with any law they might pass. The noble Lord had stated as a reason for passing this law, that the parties were not free; but how could this be any argument for making them less free? which would, he contended, be the result of the proposed enactment. Another reason that the noble Lord had given for supporting the bill was, that he was afraid to oppose it; but he must say, that he never had expected to hear intimidation made use of as an argument in that House; and still less had he thought that the noble Lord would be the person to make use of such an argument. With respect to the other arguments that had been used in favour of the measure, they appeared to him to be equally unsatisfactory; and he would venture to say, that no eminent writer on political economy could be found who should say that this Act was in conformity with the principles of that science; and he therefore hoped that the House would, at least, think it necessary to institute a very particular inquiry into the question before it proceeded to legislate upon it.

Mr. *D. Whittle Harvey.*—The hon. Member who has just sat down appears surprised, notwithstanding the number and variety of the arguments which have been pressed into this night's Debate, that no one has attended to what he said last night, or ventured to grapple with his challenge to shew what is philosophical legislation. I do not consider it inconsistent with sound philosophy to introduce from time to time, those measures which may become necessary, and which have for their object the guardianship of the rights of the labouring community from the oppression of the master; and if one proposition be more characteristic of that than another, it is this now before us. All who have opposed this measure call for inquiry, as if they were in doubt as to the object of the complaint. Do they propose to examine before the committee a greater number of witnesses than there have been petitions presented this night? Have we not had one petition signed by 17,000 persons; a second by 10,000; a third by 9,000; all complaining of a specific grievance? What they complain of is nothing ambiguous, nothing undefined, nothing but what is characteristic of the misery they endure. They state, that for their labour they cannot get their due reward in that standard of value which is convertible into the necessaries of life. It is said, that if they do not take lumps of fetid bacon, or that miserable stuff called beer, but in reality dish-water, at 6*d.* a pot, their masters will not employ them. But do we expect that these benevolent masters would give them even this, unless it was for their own advantage? As long as it is advantageous for them to employ the labourer, they will be induced to do so by the obligation of self-interest, always endeavouring to pay in that commodity which costs the least. It is in evidence, and would the examination before the committee be of a nature to controvert it, that the industrious mechanic cannot obtain the pecuniary reward of his labour, but receives in exchange those commodities which are of no use to him, and which he is obliged to travel many long and weary miles to huxter away, at a loss of more than fifty per cent on its nominal value, besides the loss of his time, consumed in the process, and which time is the poor man's stock in trade. The hon. member for Boroughbridge (Mr. Attwood), has pressed into the service of this Debate that ready recruit, which is always at his command in his frequent conflicts in this House—I mean the currency. That is the point to which all his arguments tend; and it cannot be denied, that not a bill is introduced on which, somehow or other, he does not bring it to bear. But this apparent deviation from the matter immediately before the House thus arises. The Motion before the House in reality involves the condition of the country; and the Amendment, in point of fact, is for an inquiry into the state of the nation; and hence it is, that every Gentleman feels himself at liberty to advance his peculiar views as the cause of, and the remedy for, our distress. But let us reason as long as we may, with or without Committees of Inquiry, it must all come to this—that the country is over-borne with unequal taxation, and that it is utterly impossible that our various affairs can be carried on with the restricted monetary means now at our disposal. It is, therefore, incumbent on this House, as speedily as possible, not only to take into consideration the actual amount of taxation, which must, under all circumstances, be great and oppressive, but the mode of equalizing it. I cannot agree with those hon. Members who would postpone the consideration of the question until this House be radically reformed—the time for which, I trust, is not far distant. I do not consider this House so imperfect in its composition and feelings as to be incompetent to entertain this subject; and after the earnest, honest, and straightforward assurances of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I not only hope for the absolute repeal of four or five millions of taxes, but for nine or ten millions of those which bear almost exclusively on the industrious labour of the country; and for this latter portion, that he will find a substitute in a well-ordered and impartially-regulated property-tax. An hon. Gentleman near me, the member for Wootton Bassett,—of whose speech it is impossible to speak too highly,—opposes this bill, and indeed evades it, by supporting a committee, because, he says, the payment of labour in truck is one of those necessary evils by which fraud is artfully concealed from the poor--it acting as a subtle contrivance for plundering the labourer of twenty-five or thirty per cent of his wages. Against that odious doctrine I must enter my protest; for whatever wages a man can earn ought to be paid to him in money which he can convert to such purposes as his necessities—for I fear I cannot speak of his comforts—require; and whatever controls that power, is an act of injustice. Other considerations present themselves to my mind, but the hour of the night prevents me from saying more than that I give the bill to compel the payment of wages in money my cordial support.

Mr. *Warburton* said, that the hon. Genman opposite (Mr. Harvey) had not pointed out in what way the measure before the House would remedy the evil complained of. One of the members of Government had said, he was afraid to refuse legislating in compliance with the wishes expressed in the petitions, while the other two of his colleagues who had spoken, approved of the measure, without stating how they expected the alleged remedy to operate. Much had been said of the theories of political economists—but he, for one, would say, that its motto was "*Nullius in verba*"—he would say, too, of political economy, what had been said of legislation, that it was a science which had the happiness of mankind for its object, and experience for its guide.

Sir *Francis Burdett* said, that in the present Debate he stood in the extraordinary predicament of one who agreed with what had been said by the Gentlemen, both for and against the present measure. He might use the words of Sir Roger de Coverley, that "much might be said on both sides." But above all, he agreed with what had fallen from the hon. member for Boroughbridge, although he knew that there were some persons—aye, and some Members of that House—who would put him in a straight-waistcoat for so saying. It was his opinion, that the changes which had taken place in the currency were the great causes of the derangement of the relations of all classes of society. If the evils thus occasioned were not remedied in time, they would go on increasing, and ultimately produce difficulties under which the country must sink. In that opinion he was confirmed more and more every day. In all classes, with agriculturists, and merchants, and manufacturers, he found the one universal complaint to be, that they could not obtain prices which would enable them to pay the taxes. Such being his conviction, he should not act fairly towards the hon. member for Boroughbridge, if he did not state his entire acquiescence in the opinion of that hon. Gentleman, however unpopular that opinion might be. He knew that it was unpopular with many hon. Members of that House, who believed that the change of the currency was an unwise measure at the time when it was effected but who thought that now it was better, and likely to be attended with less calamity, to persevere than to attempt to retrace their steps. They might be right, but he could not think so. If they would reconsider the whole measure, and its consequences, they would find it the source of all the evils which at present afflicted society; from all which he believed the country would recover, if the error of that change were even now repaired. He thought that he heard from the hon. member for Colchester one sentence, in which he especially concurred. It was to the effect—that, in the present state of the currency, the present amount of taxes and other burthens could not be endured. He entirely approved of the principle of the system proposed by the hon. member for Staffordshire; and surely, if the labouring part of the population merited the high eulogium passed upon them by the hon. member for Middlesex, they were competent to judge of that measure, in which their interests were immediately affected, and of which their experience enabled them to judge. He could not approve of the sentiment expressed by that hon. Member who had said, that when his own reason had been convinced, he would not yield to the mistaken notions of others. On a question like the present, he considered it both expedient and just to yield to the feelings of the persons interested, unless some serious evil was likely to result from such acquiescence. But hon. Members had talked of the necessity for inquiry, before the House should take any steps upon the subject. Now, to talk of inquiry in the House of Commons, concerning any complaint of the people, was to tell them that it was intended to give them no relief, but to baffle their expectations by delay. He, for one, would be willing to inquire to the bottom into every subject connected with the state of the country; but the measure before the House raised no occasion for inquiry, as it was plain that it could do no evil, and that it might be, at least, a palliative for evils which were acknowledged to exist, and for which those who suffered them considered it a remedy. In that case, they were more capable, by reason of their experience and intimacy with the subject, to form a just opinion than the most scientific political economist. He was as much impressed as any man with the value of political economy; and he was himself, perhaps, too much a theorist; but he knew that the soundest theory might be applied in a manner calculated to produce effects the most opposite to its natural results. Such, he believed, to have been the case with respect to the currency; and he believed, that if one great man, of whom the House and the country had been deprived, were now amongst them—he meant the late Mr. Ricardo—the characteristic candour of that lamented Gentleman would lead him to acknowledge, that he, with many other hon. Members, including himself, had been in error. He wished, however, to see the principles of political economy fully put into practice in respect to the intercourse of this country with other nations. He was sure that the removal of all restrictions upon British commerce with neighbouring States, especially with France, would promote the prosperity of both. With respect to the object of the hon. Gentleman's bill, he would only add, that the bill would not make any compulsory arrangements between the employers and the labourers. It would only enable the latter to obtain payment for their labour in money, if they did not choose to accept it in goods.

Mr. *Cresset Pelham* said, that he would by no means refuse his assent to a measure which would tend to alleviate distress where distress existed. In the part of the country with which he was most acquainted he saw no indications of distress greater than he had always before known to prevail. The people around him, as far as he had opportunity of observing, wore, at least, the appearance of content. He knew, however, that the people disliked the truck-system very much; he believed it to be very injurious, and therefore he would support the measure.

Mr. *Littleton* said, that as the Members seemed impatient, he would not detain them by making the observations in reply which he should otherwise have considered it his duty to make. He would remind the House that the question which he had submitted was, whether they would give him leave to bring in a bill on the subject which had that evening occasioned so much discussion? Of that bill, the object would be little more than to render effectual the laws which already existed. His hon. friend (if the member for Bridport would allow him to use the term) had called on the member for Colchester to explain in what manner the bill would put down the abuses complained of. Now, it was too much to ask of any hon. member to explain how a bill would operate, of which he yet knew none of the provisions.

The House divided. The numbers were—For the Motion 167; Against it 27; Majority 140.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, Dec. 15.

Minutes.] Petitions presented. For the abolition of Slavery, by Lord Suffield, Lord King, Lord Wharncliffe, and Lord Gosford, from various Congregations of Dissenters. By Lord Suffield, for Lord Holland, from the Town of Nottingham, against the Truck-system, and for the Redress of Grievances.

Parliamentary Reform.] The Duke of *Hamilton* presented Petitions from Linlithgow, Hamilton, in the County of Lanark, and a third from another place in Scotland, all in favour of Reform in Parliament. He fully agreed with the prayers of these petitioners. He was glad to have the honour of laying them before their Lordships; and he could assure their Lordships, they were the forerunners of many others. He should not have made one observation in presenting them, had it not been said in another place, that the people of Edinburgh wanted no Reform in Parliament. That assertion was disproved by a meeting lately held there, in which all the leading inhabitants had agreed to support the Petition for Reform.—Petition laid on the Table.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, Dec. 15.

MINUTES.] A New Writ was ordered for Plympton Earle, in the room of Viscount VALLETORT, who had accepted the Chiltern Hundreds.

Bills. Mr. HUGHES HUGHES obtained leave to bring in a Bill, to amend the Building Acts. The Patents Continuation Bill went through a Committee. The Witnesses Examination Bill, the Interpleaders Bill, the Prohibition and Mandamus Bill, and the Arbitration Bill, were all read a second time. The Lords' Amendments to the Administration of Justice Amendment Bill were agreed to.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. MACAULEY, various Reports and Correspondence relative to the treatment of Slaves:—On the Motion of Mr. ELLICE, the Imports and Exports of Ireland:—On the Motion of Lord NUGENT, accounts of Cotton and Deal imported, and Ships mortgaged, belonging to the Port of London.

Petitions presented. For the abolition of Slavery, by Mr. EWART, three from Protestant Dissenters of Liverpool and its neighbourhood:—By Sir G. HEATHCOTE, four from various places in Rutlandshire:—By Mr. R. GRANT, eight from various places in Scotland:—By Mr. ADEANE, from a place in Cambridge:—By Sir A. CHICHESTER, from Belfast, praying for compensation:—By Lord BOYLE, four from Cork:—By Sir W. INGILBY, from Welbourn:—By Sir R. INGLIS, from a place in the East Riding of York:—By Mr. BURTON, from Beverley:—By Mr. MACAULEY, 200 from certain Dissenting Congregations in Somersetshire:—By Mr. BRISCOE, from several places in Surrey:—By Lord J. RUSSELL, from Dissenters in Bedfordshire. By the same noble Lord, from Tavistock, for the extension of the Franchise, and for Vote by Ballot:—By Mr. JOHNSTONE, from Inverkeithing, and another Burgh in Scotland. For the repeal of the Assessed Taxes, by Sir G. ROBINSON, from Northampton:—By Mr. BARTON, from Beverley:—By Mr. LEIGH LEIGH, from Wells. By Mr. ADEANE, from Wisbeach, praying that the Provisions of the Local Courts Bill might be extended to Cambridge and the Isle of Ely. For the extension of the Elective Franchise to the Catholics of Galway, by Mr. BLUNT, from a Parish of Galway:—By Sir J. BOURKE, four from Protestants and Catholics of Galway. By Sir W. INGILBY, from a place in Lincoln, for a repeal of the Duty on Insurances; from Spilsby, with a similar prayer; and from Spalding, against the Tax on Coals.

COMPENSATION TO WEST-INDIAN PROPRIETORS.] Mr. *Ewart* presented a Petition from West-India merchants and others, praying for compensation if Slavery be abolished, and praying for inquiry into the condition of the slaves. The hon. Member said, he heartily concurred in the prayer of the petition, and expressed a hope, that whatever might be done, due regard would be had to the interests of the West-India proprietors. He was convinced that to produce favourable results the abolition of slavery must be gradual.

General *Gascoyne* also supported the prayer of the petition, and expressed a doubt whether the people would be willing to submit to be taxed to compensate the planters, though persons admitted that such compensation was necessary. The sum necessary for the purpose would probably augment the burthens of the State one fourth, though the amount was not yet settled, and he could not, therefore, speak positively. He would, however, be glad to submit even to that to have the question set at rest, and he was in hopes that the hon. and learned member for Yorkshire, who gave a notice, would have brought the matter to a conclusion. His zeal, it appeared, was checked by the Government; the wild elephant had been yoked to the tame ones of office, and he went quietly in harness like them. The hon. Gentleman gave notice, that when the question was discussed, he should move, "That an inquiry be instituted to ascertain what compensation should be given to the planters."

Mr. *A. Trevor* said, that he would cordially second the gallant General.

PENSIONS ON THE CIVIL LIST (IRELAND.)] Sir *John Newport* rose to move "that an humble Address be presented for a copy of the grant of a pension on the Irish Civil List, to Charles Hooper and P. Martin, and their representatives, specifying the term for which it was granted, and the conditions, if any, thereunto annexed, as also the names of the persons to whom it is now payable." The circumstances connected with this pension, were these:—It was granted so far back as the year 1756, for what he knew not; but it was granted, with this condition, that it should be continued annually until the sum of 2,000*l.* should be paid to the party at one payment. The payments had been continued up to the present time; out of what notion of economy he was at a loss to guess. It was paying for all that time, an interest of 10*l.* per cent on 2,000*l.*, which might be easily obtained at present at three-and-a-half per cent. But the Irish Civil List had always been remarkable for its extravagance. As one instance, he might mention a case which occurred in the time of the Irish Parliament. The name of George Charles appeared for a long time on the List as a pensioner to the amount of 1,200*l.* a-year, but no person knew who this George Charles was. At last a return was moved for, setting forth who the party receiving the sum was, and on what account it was granted; and from that return it appeared that George Charles was the Count de Veri, the Sardinian Ambassador, to whom the pension had been granted for some real or supposed services performed to this country in the negotiations connected with the Treaty of Paris. No doubt many other similar cases might be mentioned.

The Jews.] Mr. *R. Grant*, in presenting a Petition from the Jews of London, in favour of the Emancipation of the Jews, stated that he should, on Thursday, the 17th of February, bring forward a motion on the subject. But that notice was to be subject to the passing or not of the bill for abolishing the Oath of Abjuration. That bill, if it passed, would, he believed, affect the condition of the Jews, and, with some slight modification, would accomplish all that he sought. Should that be the effect of the bill, though he did not affirm that it would, his motion would be unnecessary. He should rather, however, that the matter were considered above board than collaterally and incidentally.

Colonel *Cradock* took the opportunity of asking, as it had been stated that the Jews were outcasts in the land, if a Jew, whose father, grandfather, and great grandfather were born in Monmouth-street, would be considered as a native of this country, and if he were taken with arms in his hands, fighting against this country in the service of a foreign State, would he be punished as a native-born subject? Would his plea that he was a Syrian be admitted? If it would not, then it was hard to deprive the Jew of civil rights, and extremely hard to recognize his birth only to make it a pretext for punishment. He would certainly support the motion of the right hon. Gentleman.

Sir *R. Inglis* would not answer the question; but when the subject came before the House he would discuss it.

Mr. *R. Grant* would be prepared to explain the situation of these people, naturalized in this country, when the question was discussed.

General *Gascoyne* would watch the Oath of Abjuration bill, after what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. *R. Grant* had given no opinion as to the legal construction of the Oath of Abjuration Repeal bill.

Petition to be printed.

Sinecures in Scotland.] On a Motion that some Petitions be laid on the Table,

Mr. *William Dundas* took occasion to allude to the observations made by the hon. member for Ayr (Mr. Kennedy,) when he thought fit the other evening, to allude to the offices held by him (Mr. Dundas) in Scotland. The hon. Member had then stated the income of those offices at a sum of 7,000*l.* a year, but he would find, on inquiry, that he had allowed himself to become the instrument of much misrepresentation and exaggeration on this subject. It was quite true that peculiar circumstances, to which he need not advert, had in one year made the total income 7,800*l.*, but on an average, the three offices of Lord Register, Register of the Sasines, and Keeper of the Signet, produced only 4,500*l.* a-year. It should be recollected, however, that, as Register, the securities for the holding of the greater part of the landed property of Scotland passed through his office, and accuracy in the clerks was necessary; and that he (Mr. Dundas) was held responsible for every error they committed. So far, indeed, had this been carried, that the insertion of George 3rd, instead of George 2nd, had produced an action in one case, in which he was compelled to pay damages to the amount of 400*l.*; and in another, the bare omission of a word had cost him 300*l.* The office was not, therefore, without duty and responsibility, and he thought the hon. Member should have given himself some time for accurate inquiry before he made exaggerated representations to the House.

Mr. *Kennedy* said, he had endeavoured to fulfil a public duty with as great a degree of courtesy to the right hon. Gentleman as circumstances would allow, and he had certainly not trusted so much to hearsay information as the right hon. Gentleman supposed. He had made diligent inquiries on the subject, and he begged it to be distinctly understood, that his object was not to bring any odium on the right hon. Gentleman, but to enable the Government to correct the errors which were visible in an important parliamentary paper, and to guard against their recurrence. At the same time, however, he must say, that supposing the right hon. Gentleman's statement respecting the income of 5,000*l.* to be correct, he did not hear of any services required by the offices, nor did he recollect any services performed by the right hon. Gentleman, which entitled him to receive so large a sum from sinecure situations, in the present distressed state of the country.

Sir *G. Warrender* recommended a revision of all the pensions and sinecures drawn from the resources of the country; and although he felt that no man would be willing to touch the pension of a Nelson, or the Conqueror of Waterloo, yet as the 5,000*l.* granted to the family of the Duke of Marlborough had been reduced twenty-seven per cent, he thought every other pension and sinecure, should be subjected to a reduction at least to that amount. The right hon. Gentleman, after alluding to the noble example set by the Marquis Camden, observed, that the late Earl of Stair, the moment he came to his family property, resigned a diplomatic pension of 1,500*l* a-year—an example which it would be to the honour of many of the noble families of the country to follow at the present moment. For his part he was determined, if the Government failed to insist on ample reductions in the sinecures and pensions, to bring the subject fully and fairly under the consideration of Parliament.

The Petitions laid on the Table.

THE LIVING OF STANHOPE.] Lord James Stuart having presented a Petition from Cardiff, for a Reduction of Taxation,

Mr. *Phillpotts* took the opportunity to ask the noble Lord (Althorp,) whether the Ministers had made up their minds with respect to the annexing of the Living of Stanhope, to be held *in commendam* by his right reverend relation, with the Bishopric of Exeter, as the noble Lord had declared on a former occasion, that the Government had felt it necessary to delay the issue of the instrument required for that purpose?

Lord *Althorp*, in answer to the question of the hon. and learned Gentleman, begged to state distinctly to the House, and he hoped it would be also clearly understood in the country, that in any step which his Majesty's Ministers might feel it their duty to take with regard to the separation of the Living of Stanhope from the Bishopric of Exeter, they were not actuated by any personal considerations towards the right reverend Prelate; and that it was not on account of the person who was to hold the Living, but on public grounds that they felt it their duty to advise his Majesty to delay the issue of the instrument necessary for holding that living *in commendam.* They considered it a gross abuse to permit a Living of such importance, and requiring the constant attention of the incumbent, to be held by any person who must necessarily reside at such a distance from that Living, and they had, therefore, come to the determination of advising his Majesty not to give his sanction to the arrangement. In doing this, however, it was impossible for the Government not to feel that a very great hardship was inflicted on the right reverend Prelate, because it was aware that he had accepted the Bishopric of Exeter, with the understanding that he was, as had been done before, to hold the Living of Stanhope *in commendam* along with it. His Majesty's Ministers felt regret that the determination they had come to would produce so much disadvantage to the right reverend person who now held the See of Exeter; and he was authorized to state, that it was their intention to compensate the right reverend Prelate for this loss, by adding to the See of Exeter the first Church preferment in the gift of the Crown which fell vacant, and did not involve in its duties that cure of souls which the Living of Stanhope required, and which had been the cause o the offence taken to the late recommendation. He considered, that the step now taken towards preventing the practice of the holding of many Livings, at a distance from each other, and under circumstances which precluded the performance of the sacred duties belonging to those Livings by the incumbents, was of the greatest importance, with a view to support the Church establishment at the present moment. He was sure that the correction of the abuses of non-residence, and a rigid enforcement of the regular performance of clerical duties, would not endanger, but promote, the interests of the Church; and it was the determination of his Majesty's Ministers, in every case where such abuses came under their cognizance, to use their most strenuous endeavours to remove or to amend them.

Petition laid on the Table.

MAGISTRACY OF IRELAND.] *O'Gorman Mahon* thought it was necessary to preface the Motion with which he meant to conclude, by some few explanatory remarks. He wished to have a return of the number and names of the Magistrates of Ireland, distinguishing those acting by a commission from the Lord Chancellor, from those acting under other authority. He must disclaim anything like a desire to make any invidious distinctions between those parties. At a moment such as this, however, when the country was looking forward to the benefits which had been promised her—he trusted with all sincerity, —and entertained hopes which he had no doubt would be realized, there was no subject to which it was more desirable to direct the attention of the House than the administration of justice in Ireland, particularly to that department of it by which the resident gentry came immediately into contact with the lower orders. He did not mean to make any general observation upon the great body of the Magistracy; but, unfortunately, the experience of Ireland shewed, that in former appointments there had not been a proper scrutiny into the rank, station, and acquirements, and into the character of those appointed to be Magistrates, so as to have none but those entitled to respect in the minds of the people. There were persons in the commission of the peace, who however incredible it might seem in an English House of Commons, were scarcely above the very lowest of the community over which they had to preside, and whose past, as well as present character was such as to make it utterly impossible that any respect could be entertained for them. Further, he could point out individuals in the commission of the peace in Ireland accused of the worst acts, guilty of fraudulent practices, guilty of defrauding their creditors two or three different times, and who had taken the benefit of the Insolvent Act, and had had a Commission of Bankruptcy issued against them. Such were some of the men who occupied a Bench, on which ought only to be seated men of unsullied character. Were he to detail some circumstances connected with the conduct of a part of the Magistracy of Ireland, which were well known to gentlemen acquainted with that country, he should almost be charged with practising on the credulity of the House. There were among them men who had connived at mal-practices which it was their duty to repress, and who had actually participated in acts which were infringements of the law. If, in addition to that, he could point out individuals who made it a practice to receive pay and bribes from criminals, protecting those whom they were bound to punish, it could not be denied, that such a return as he wished to have must prove useful to the Administration. He was only actuated by a desire that the magisterial body should be pure and sound, as intended by the Legislature. The hon. Member concluded by moving—"That there be laid before this House, a Return of the number and names of those at present in the Commission of the Peace in each County, City, and Town, in Ireland; distinguishing in each the number and names of clergymen and laymen; also distinguishing the names of those Magistrates in each department who have qualified to preside on Road Sessions; and specifying the number and nature of offices (if any), civil or military, under the Crown, or otherwise, held by each or any of such Magistrates, and the probable amount of salary or pay derived therefrom; also specifying the known profession, public employment or trade, heretofore or at present pursued by each; also, the number and names of those Magistrates who, in each County, City, and Town, have suspended payment, or taken the benefit of the Insolvent Act, or had missions of Bankruptcy issued against them; and stating how often such Com- Commission of Bankruptcy have issued against the same individual; such Return to distinguish also the number and names of those Magistrates appointed under City or Corporate authority from those deriving their Commissions of the Peace from the Lord Chancellor; also, a return of the number and names of those who have been appointed Magistrates in each County, City, and Town, in Ireland, since the year 1810, with the names and number of those who have been superseded in that period, up to the latest period."

Colonel *O'Grady* was sure that the Magistrates were so conscious of the unfounded nature of the hon. Gentleman's charges, that they would, if they knew them, be the first to move for those returns. When imputations were cast upon the Magistrates generally of Ireland, he felt bound to say, that those of the county which he had the honour to represent, had set an example in putting down the disturbances which, now that disturbances prevailed here, it would be well if the Magistrates of England followed. They risked life and fortune in support of the laws, and their courage and firmness had had their reward; and he, as well as every other Irishman, owed them thanks for their conduct. It was with pleasure that he availed himself of that opportunity to do them justice. He had been informed that the new Lord Chancellor of Ireland meant to examine into the condition of the Magistracy, and put out of the commission any improper persons, and it would be better that the matter should be left in his hands than that it should be brought before the House. By the general practice in Ireland, a Magistrate who became insolvent, lost his office; and if there existed any such cases as had been stated by the hon. mover, they must be unknown to the Lord Chancellor. There could be no doubt that it was the intention and wish of that Officer to remedy whatever evils might exist in his department, and to him he wished the matter might be left. In what he had said, he had no other object in view than to rescue the Magistrates of Ireland from the unfavourable impression which the speech of the hon. Member might possibly create.

Lord *Valentia* had never heard any well-founded attack on the Magistrates of Ireland. He had always found them, in all cases and at all times, willing to do their duty. Perhaps the resolution of his hon. friend, the member for Clare, might be viewed as rather invidious, and he thought it would be much better to leave the subject altogether in the hands of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, who had been so recently appointed to his situation, than to bring it before the House. If the papers were laid upon the Table they might bring into discussion circumstances which, perhaps, would not be altogether proper for the House to notice. If the hon. member for Clare thought that the Magistracy of Ireland had acted improperly, or that improper persons were selected, let him make a motion that would bring that opinion before the House, and allow it to be substantiated or refuted. He was satisfied that, taking them as a body, no charge could be brought against the Magistracy of Ireland. He certainly should not oppose granting the returns, but he did not believe that they would afford the hon. Member the information which he wished to gain. He hoped that the hon. Member would withdraw his Motion.

Mr. *Maxwell* did not know a more honourable body of men—men more attached to the laws, or more humane in their conduct, than the Magistracy of Ireland. He was well acquainted with the situation of many Irish counties, and, therefore, could speak without hesitation on the subject. He doubted whether these returns could be procured, or whether any advantage would result from laying them on the Table. The hon. Member had better wait and see the result of the revision which the Lord Chancellor was to undertake.

Mr. *Jephson* did not see any great benefit that would result from having the returns, and if his hon. friend pressed his Motion to a division he should vote against it. The Clerk of the Peace was not obliged to know the profession or calling of persons in the commission of the peace; and, therefore might not be able to make the return required.

Sir *Francis Burdett* said, for his part, he had no objection to the Motion, nor had he heard any argument against granting the returns. If persons had been placed among the Magistracy of Ireland, who ought not to have been there, this return would merely shew whether that were the case or not. He did not know how the officer could be directed to make these returns, but there might be some means of getting at the information required. Neither did he know how the Lord Chancellor, before a man was appointed to the commission of the peace, should inquire into all the circumstances of his life, for this would be both invidious and painful. He thought the returns of importance, and hoped they would be granted without opposition.

Mr. *Calcraft* said, that when returns were moved for, it was customary to state what parliamentary object the Member moving for them had in view. He saw no objection to granting these returns; but he wished to ask the hon. Member, what he intended to do with them. He felt, that if he were a Magistrate of Ireland, he should be entitled to know what the motive of the hon. Member was. He should be glad to know whether the hon. Member intended to attach blame to any quarter, or whether he thought that some benefit might be derived from having the names of the Irish Magistrates on the Table, to undergo the revision of the House. He was not aware, however, that the House would have any right to interfere, except in a case of gross impropriety of conduct in the discharge of the magisterial functions. He should not, however, give a decided opinion upon the subject, until he heard from the hon. Member what object he had in view.

Mr. *Ruthven* thought, the hon. gentleman had put a most extraordinary question to his hon. friend. He had asked him what he intended to do with these returns, supposing them to be granted? and what object he had in view? How could his hon. friend answer that question until the papers were granted? It had been stated, that improper persons were among the Magistracy of Ireland. His hon. friend wished to find whether that was the case or not. There was nothing of more importance to Ireland than its Magistracy, and he was sure that this motion was not brought forward with a view of throwing on that class the least obloquy. Nobody supposed that the late or the present Chancellor had appointed improper persons to the commission of the peace. He was satisfied that Sir Anthony Hart, who was an excellent Lord Chancellor, would never have sanctioned an improper appointment; for the late Chancellor, fortunately for Ireland, was not a political character. No man could entertain a higher opinion of Lord Plunkett than he did, and he hoped that the noble Lord would not suffer the politics of Ireland to enter into his conduct with regard to the Magistracy of Ireland. He had a most important and difficult duty imposed upon him, though there was no doubt that he would perform it to the satisfaction of the country. He was a man of pre-eminent abilities, and of unimpeachable integrity; but there was some degree of alarm, that he might not be able entirely to get rid of feelings which influenced, in a slight degree, the conduct of the most honest men, but which would be attended with most mischievous consequences to Ireland, if they were suffered to give a colour to the conduct of Lord Chancellor Plunkett. For himself he must say, that he had no personal feeling to gratify; he knew the Magistracy of Ireland well; he was acquainted with them, having been long a Magistrate himself, and no man could speak more highly of a body of men than he was ready to speak of the Irish Magistracy. In his part of the country they had acted with the greatest advantage, both to themselves and the neighbourhood, and he did not hesitate to say, that the country owed a debt to the Magistracy of Ireland for preserving the peace of that country. He would even say, that they had set an example to the Magistrates of England. They never shrunk from doing their duty in seasons of difficulty; but when dangers appeared, they laid aside differences of political opinions, and thought only of preserving peace, and of supporting the law and the Constitution. He would further observe, that the country had derived the greatest benefits from the introduction of Petty Sessions; the beneficial effects of which were exemplified every day in the improved condition of the country; while the people were made aware of the benefits they derived from the Magistracy of Ireland. In the part of the country with which he was connected, the people entertained the greatest respect for the Magistracy, and the most perfect reliance on the administrators of the laws; and no evil could arise from these returns being made. He saw no objection to the Motion. It was somewhat invidious to insinuate that the hon. Member who moved for the returns must have some ulterior object in view. If, however, there were improper persons in the commission of the peace let them be removed. It had been stated that some had been bankrupts, and confined in gaol; but how could the Chancellor know this? or, how could he get at any information on the subject? No man ever held a public situation who discharged his duties more satisfactorily to the people than the late Chancellor of Ireland, and he trusted that the present Chancellor would also merit the approbation of the country. He admitted that much injury had been done by giving encouragement to carry whisperings to the Castle at Dublin; but he hoped the day of those practices had now passed away. He considered the subject one of vast importance to Ireland; he hoped the returns would be granted, and if any necessity were found for it, that the Magistracy would be revised and purified.

Mr. *Calcraft* did not mean to say, that a Member was bound to state, on every occasion, the object which he had in view when he moved for returns? Although this was what was called an Irish question, he did not make any apology to the hon. Member for taking part in it, because he considered every question connected with Ireland of the same importance as a matter purely English. He knew no distinction or at least none ought to exist, As an English Magistrate, if a return had been moved for, relating to that body, he should have demanded an explanation. If there were grounds of complaint against any specific Magistrates, the returns moved for ought to be respecting those only, and not such as to throw an imputation on the whole body of Magistrates.

Mr. *Hudson Gurney* thought, that the returns moved for would be almost useless, unless the hon. Member had some great object in view regarding the public convenience. It would be a cruel thing to drag gentlemen before the House without such an object. It could serve no useful purpose to have the record of any man's misfortunes laid on the Table. It would be infinitely better, therefore, for the hon. Member to limit his Motion.

Mr. *John Campbell* had not the honour of being an Irishman, but he trusted that he might offer a few words on the present question. The Motion of the hon. Member was not only applicable to all Magistrates really in the commission of the peace, but would include all Municipal Magistrates, or those who had to discharge the duties of that office in any town or city of Ireland. The hon. Member must be aware that the Chancellor had no control over this latter class of Magistrates. The return, then, would be highly objectionable, as it would state, perhaps to the ruin of many of those city Magistrates, that at one time of their lives they had been bankrupts. [*O'Gorman Mahon* explained, that his return was confined to those actually in the commission of the peace.] In what a painful situation would the House place a Magistrate by putting such a question to him. He had no doubt that such a return might lead to the ruin of many mercantile firms which had now the highest character. He should therefore oppose the Motion.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* said, that the hon. Member, in endeavouring to discover extraordinary grievances, had moved for extraordinary returns. It was impossible for him to discover what object the hon. Member could have in view in endeavouring to obtain these returns; but they would expose to the world the private affairs of the Magistracy, which would not even be creditable to the Inquisition in Spain, still less to a British House of Commons. He certainly should oppose the Motion, as it was highly improper. What a situation would the House place many respectable persons in by ordering these returns! A man at some time might not have taken up a bill of exchange on its becoming due, or he might have been unable to pay his tailor immediately on demand, or any other trumpery debt: and, for this, was he to be dragged before the country? If a man had refused to pay a bill, was he to be pointed out in this paper as an insolvent? If there were a single man in the House who would divide on this question, he would be with him; but if he went out of the door alone, he would certainly oppose the Motion. In that House, and in most of the good society of England, there was an absence of this prying into the personal or private affairs of individuals, and a contempt for an inquiry whether any misfortune had befallen a man in his previous career in life. It was the duty of the House to abstain from such proceedings, and to discountenance such inquiries. Every rule of law or moral conduct was against adopting such a course; and every man must see the evils which would arise from such a proceeding. For that House to institute such an inquisition would be most dangerous; and he meant strenuously to resist the hon. Gentleman's Motion.

Lord *Althorp* said, that the hon. Member had asked him, before he proposed his Motion for the returns, whether there would be any objection to it; and he answered, that he was not aware of any; but he must add, that this Motion differed from what he (Lord Althorp) expected it would be. It would not be desirable to drag the name of every Magistrate before the House who had been a bankrupt; and the hon. Member, he was sure, would not desire to attach a reproach to a man because he had been in pecuniary difficulties. Any information with respect to the Magistrates of Ireland, he should be happy to afford, but he did not think that these returns would be desirable. There was a great objection to making inquiries into the pecuniary circumstances of the Magistracy. The feeling of the House was decidedly hostile to the Motion of the hon. Gentleman, and he therefore suggested to him the propriety of withdrawing it.

O'Gorman Mahon would acquiesce, readily in the recommendation of the noble Lord; but he could not see any objection to making the returns. He was surprised at the language which had been used, and he could not allow the opportunity to pass without replying to the observations of some hon. and learned Gentlemen, who had been pleased to insinuate that he moved for these returns from some uncommon motive. He never thought there could be the least objection to giving returns respecting the conduct and character of public officers,—for such the Magistracy certainly were. As soon as a person was appointed to the commission of the peace, he became a public man, and must expect to have his views and conduct in public life strictly scrutinised. He had reason to believe that there were improper persons in the commission of the peace, and he wished to know whether it were the case or no. He did not understand exactly the language of the hon. member for Boroughbridge, (Sir C. Wetherell) nor the tone of lecturing which he adopted. Although the age of that hon. and learned Member might be a sufficient reason for his respecting him, it was not sufficient to make him put up with the strange language he had used. He utterly disclaimed the idea of making any attack on the Magistracy of Ireland; and the hon. and learned Member put language into his mouth which he never uttered. He had made no attack on the Magistracy of Ireland; and he appealed to the House, whether he did not say, that he had no intention of attacking that body. It was with a view of excluding from that respectable body the weeds which had crept in amongst it, that he proposed his Motion. His hon. friend, the member for Limerick, was completely mistaken in imagining that he wanted a thorough investigation into the affairs of all the Magistracy of Ireland. He stated, that they were respectable men—which was admitted; but he must complain of the language of the hon. Member; for though he did not know the character of the Magistracy in the county of Limerick, he did not think it stood quite so high as his hon. friend wished to place it. He certainly did know instances of not altogether proper conduct of Magistrates in his own neighbourhood, but he had not many opportunities of viewing their conduct, because he was no longer a Magistrate, having been superseded. Did his hon. friend forget the conduct of some late Magistrates in his own country? They determined to resist the popular prejudices on some points, feeling they might lead to disturbances of the public peace. But how did they proceed? Not in a common way, as other men would have done. Did his hon. friend recollect a round-robin which these gallant men signed, expressive of a determination to maintain the peace, which they were afraid to sign in the common mode? Did he forget, also, that, but a very few days ago, some of those very Magistrates were fined for improper conduct in a Court of Justice in Dublin? Did he forget that those Magistrates were brought before the tribunals of their country, and that the Court inflicted a heavy fine on them? His hon. friend, the member for the county of Limerick, could not have forgotten this. The strictest investigation should be made before a man was appointed to the commission of the peace; but he had no wish to drag the private transactions of private men before the House. He did not wish to exhibit a man to the country because he had been a bankrupt. But men had been appointed Magistrates in Ireland, who had been fraudulent bankrupts, more than once or twice. He repeated, he knew men in that situation who had been guilty of fraud; and it certainly did not appear to him that these were proper persons to be intrusted with the administration of justice. What would be the feelings of the peasant, carried before such a Magistrate, for being unable to pay *5s.* The Magistrate, no doubt, would order him to pay, but what must the peasant think of seeing the Magistrate in the enjoyment of great wealth, after committing gross frauds, while he was sent to gaol if he could not pay the *5s.*? Such persons ought not, he repeated, to be in the commission of the peace, if tranquillity was to be preserved. His hon. friend, the member for Wexford (Lord Valentia) said, that if the House assented to this Motion, it might be considered as a reflection on the conduct of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland. He could not conceive how this could be the case, as he was not, perhaps, so likely to get at information of this sort as the House, of Commons, unless he listened to private whispers, which would be most pernicious. No man could entertain a higher opinion than he did of Sir Anthony Hart, and he believed that no man who ever presided in a Court of Justice was more divested of everything like political feeling. When he (O'Gorman Mahon) was an agitator, he removed him from the commission of the peace; it was by his orders that the *supersedeas* was issued; but he did not feel angry with him on that account, because he was satisfied that his conduct had been misrepresented to the Lord Chancellor. His countrymen thought, that he had suffered in consequence of his attachment to the public cause, and they wished to make a present to him to commemorate his humble public services, but he declined receiving this mark of esteem, out of respect to Sir Anthony Hart. He refused, because he did not wish his countrymen to believe that a political motive had influenced the conduct of that excellent Judge. He had not alluded to this before; but he could then fairly do so and openly, because Sir Anthony Hart was no longer in office. But to return to the subject of his Motion: he had no wish to drag all the Magistrates before the House, though he was desirous of finding out the improper persons amongst them. If, by pointing them out to the Lord Chancellor, so that they might not be re-appointed; if any Member would come forward manfully, and place his finger on the names of such persons, all the complaints against the Irish Magistracy would be removed. He certainly should have no objection to see the names of those gallant men who signed the round-robin to maintain the public peace, brought before the House; nor should he have any objection to see the names of those who were fined 500*l.* the other day in the highest Court of Justice in Ireland, published. He could assure the hon. member for Boroughbridge, that if he was desirous of dividing, he would oblige him; he would come to the point, and allow him, if he pleased, to walk into the lobby. He had no wish to disagree with him—but the contrary; still he could not put up with the tone he used. He would tell the House, that if it were desirous of having peace and tranquillity in Ireland, it must make the administration of justice pure. One bad Magistrate did more to shake the confidence of the people in the purity of the administration of the laws than any ten good men could to establish it. He had no objection to adopt the recommendation of his noble friend, the member for Wexford, and his gallant friend, the member for the county of Limerick, to leave the matter to the investigation of the Lord Chancellor, who, he had no doubt, would do ample justice between the parties. With respect to the observations of the hon. member for Wareham (Mr. Calcraft) that hon. Member was not justified in asking him what course he intended to pursue if the papers were granted and laid on the Table. His object was perfectly fair and open. He had no wish to insult or injure any of the Magistrates of Ireland; but he conceived that he was entitled to move for the production of any papers which were calculated to promote the welfare of that country, without having it insinuated that his wishes were improper. He had been a Magistrate himself, and he knew that there were persons in the commission of the peace who ought never to have been appointed; that bankrupts, and persons convicted of fraud, ought not to be on the Bench. There were others also who had neither wealth, education, nor character, to justify their appointment. For instance, he knew a small town in the southern part of Ireland, where there was a post-office at a little shop, and when a person wanted a letter, he had to tap at a window, which was opened, and the letter given out, and he paid his sixpence and received his twopence change. And by whom was this done—who was the keeper of this little post-office—who was the receiver of the fourpence? A person who was in the commission of the peace for an Irish county. What would any hon. Member say, if such was the case in this country,—would he not indignantly exclaim against it? He did not mean to say that the person he alluded to was not a respectable man in his way, but he conceived that no human being would assert that he was in a situation to administer justice to the people of Ireland. He had no wish to injure the feelings of any man, and he was, therefore, sorry that the discussion had taken such a turn; but if any hon. Member would lend his assistance to promote an improvement of the Irish Magistracy, by pointing out to the Lord Chancellor persons who were unfit to be Magistrates, he would perform a great service to Ireland.

Colonel *O'Grady* wished to say one or two words, in respect to what had fallen from the hon. Member. He could assure him that he never thought of charging him with having been actuated by an improper motive. He was, however, mistaken in one or two points, especially upon the subject of the Limerick Magistrates. He felt it his duty to state, that he knew no case—bearing out the assertions of the hon. Member; if he had, he should have felt it his duty not to have moved for the names of all the Magistrates, but to have mentioned those who had behaved improperly, and have founded ulterior proceedings upon the returns. The Magistrates of the county which he had the honour to represent had always conducted themselves in the fairest, most honourable, and most courageous manner.

Motion withdrawn.

HOUSE OF LORDS,
Thursday, Dec. 16.

Minutes.] The Administration of Justice Bill was returned from the House of Commons, with their Lordships Amendments agreed to. The Colonial Acts Validity Bill was read a second time.

Petitions presented. By the Duke of Wellington, from Haniey and Shelton, Staffordshire, against the Renewal of the East-India Company's Charter. By the Duke of Norfolk, the Marquis of Lansdown, and the Earl of Haddington, from various places, chiefly in Scotland, for the abolition of Slavery. For the repeal of the Coal Duties, by the Duke of Northumberland, from the Mayor, Aldermen, and Corporation of the Town of Newcastle-upon-Tyne:—By the Marquis of Bute, from Cardiff and Neck, in Wales. By the Earl of Darnley, from George Gunning, esq., for Reform in the administration of the Poor-laws.

Repeal of the Union with Ireland.] Lord *King* had a Petition to present to their Lordships, on a very important subject, respecting which his opinions were quite at variance with those of the petitioners. When the measure of which they complained—the Union of Great Britain and Ireland, was under the consideration of the British Legislature—he was opposed to it; because he did not wish the corruptions of England to be increased by those of Ireland. But he now feared, that it would be a mischievous experiment to repeal that measure after such a lapse of time. He believed that Ireland would suffer greatly from the separation of the two countries, the more so as they could be separated only by means of war, and to that a repeal of the Union would certainly lead. If he were an Irishman, he might perhaps be induced to consult his national feelings, in opposition to his judgment. But although he knew little of Ireland himself, and from what he did know, he believed its condition to be very wretched; yet he had heard that there had recently appeared there some signs of improvement, to which the repeal, desired by petitioners, would put a stop, by immediately checking the introduction of English capital. If the Union were repealed, Ireland would lose the present excellent market for her produce which she found in Great Britain, and which was opened to her in 1806. One of the first consequences, he believed, of the repeal of the Union would be, to exclude the produce of Ireland from the market of England, which, to the great body of her people employed in raising food for this country, would be a most serious injury. A noble friend of his had stated, that the dissolution of the Legislative Union would lead to a total separation of the two countries, which he believed, and he even believed, that such a separation would be followed by war; entertaining opinions so adverse to the petitioners' claim, he wished that they had placed the petitions in other hands. His Lordship concluded by presenting Petitions from the Paper-stainers, Carpet-weavers, and other Trades of the City of Dublin, praying for the Repeal of the Union.

Earl *Darnley* concurred fully in the opinions expressed by the noble Lord who had just addressed their Lordships; but he had differed from that noble Lord when the Act of Union was passed, for he (Earl Darnley) had advocated that measure, in the expectation that benefits to Ireland would result from it, which he had not yet had the happiness to witness. However, he believed that the good effects would now be soon observed, as the healing measure which the Legislature had most wisely adopted in the last Session had removed the chief obstacles to the improvement of that country. He was convinced that the repeal of the Union would annihilate the incipient prosperity of Ireland. The individual who at present agitated that question had derived his importance from the injudicious attempt which had been made to exclude him from the other House of Parliament. No calamity could be more destructive to the country of that individual than his efforts, should they be successful, in repealing the Union.

Tithes (Ireland).] Lord *Farnham* moved for various Returns respecting the parishes which had agreed to a Composition of Tithes in Ireland, under the late Act of Parliament on that subject. He explained, that the operation of that Act was greatly impeded by the manner in which the Select Vestries for settling the composition of tithes were constituted. The land of many parishes in Ireland was occupied principally in pasture, and in the cultivation of potatoes. Upon the latter the whole burthen of the tithes was thrown; so that the very poorest parishioners, to whom the potatoe-land, chiefly belonged, paid the most part of the tithes, from which the pasture-lands, always in the hands of the richer parishioners, were wholly exempt. Hence it became the interest of the Select Vestries, which consisted of only twenty-five persons (they being of course the richest inhabitants), to oppose the composition; because that would equalize the burthens between them and their fellow inhabitants. To enable the poor of Ireland, whose advantage the Act was chiefly calculated to promote, to benefit by its provisions, it was necessary to enlarge the Vestries. He would introduce a bill to increase them to fifty parishioners, in the course of the Session; unless the Government, in whose hands he should prefer leaving the matter, should themselves introduce such a measure. He would take that opportunity of stating, that, in those cases where the operation of the Act was prevented by the tithe-owners, the opposition was more frequently from lay impropriators than from the clergy.

Lord *King* had no doubt, that if the tithe composition Act were carried into effect in Ireland upon fair terms, it would operate greatly to the advantage of the poorer classes, who would get rid of tithe Gatherers and Proctors, and the whole harassing and expensive machinery for the recovery of those vexatious claims. He held in his hands documents respecting the tithes in six parishes of the county of Wicklow, of which the names were to him unpronounceable, occupying a surface of upwards of 40,000 acres. In those parishes a meeting of 4,000 farmers was assembled to make a composition with Archdeacon Magee. The venerable Archdeacon not agreeing with the parishioners, resorted not to the Consistory Court, but to the Court of Exchequer, as affording the most expensive process for the recovery of his tithes. He would read to their Lordships an account, furnished by the Archdeacon to one of those farmers:—

Varney Cooney, to Archdeacon Magee, debtor
Out of the Lands of Grange,

To Tithe of 47 tons of Hay at 30*s*.	£7	1	0
Ditto of 197 brls. of Barley at 16*s*.	15	15	2
Ditto of 88 brls. of Wheat at 30*s*.	13	4	0
Ditto of 193 brls. of Oats at 15*s*.	13	10	2
	£49	10	4

This land contains 12 acres of Wheat, 12½ of barley, 11 of oats, and 20 of meadowing. Any measures which would put an end to such a state of things would be beneficial.

Motion agreed to.

SLAVERY.] The Marquis of *Lansdown* presented a Petition from the Magistrates and Town Council, and principal Merchants of the City of Glasgow, praying that precautionary measures might be adopted before the Legislature should determine to abolish Slavery in the Colonies. The noble Marquis said, that although the petition which he had the honour to present, was of a different prayer to most of those which had been laid before their Lordships, yet it would be unjust to term it a petition in favour of slavery. The petitioners stated that the inhabitants of Glasgow had, from their intercourse with the West-Indies, opportunities which few others possessed, of knowing the true condition of slaves in the colonies, and although they by no means advocated the perpetuation of negro slavery, they were convinced that great mischief would be occasioned by a rash and sudden abolition.—To lie on the Table.

THE REGENCY BILL.] The *Lord Chancellor*, in the absence of his noble friend (Lord Lyndhurst), rose to move their Lordships' concurrence to some Amendments which had been made in the Regency Bill, in the House of Commons. One of them was, the making provision for a case, which certainly had not been overlooked by his noble friend in the drawing up of the Bill, but which had been, in his opinion, properly rejected by him. The Amendment was contrary to the scheme and constitution of the Bill; and it provided for a state of things which, in the opinion of the noble Lord, and in his own, could very well be provided for when the exigency itself arrived. It was to the effect that, in case her present Majesty should die, and his Majesty marry again, the Bill should expire and be invalid. Now that was a case which could not come on by surprise; and a death and a marriage of such elevated persons were not likely to happen in twenty-four hours, and therefore time must be given for legislation. Still, the Amendment had been made in the other House; and though it was an instance of care and over-anxiety, more than of necessity, still, for the sake of unanimity, and as his noble friend had no objection to it, he recommended their Lordships to agree to it.

The Marquis of *Lansdown* said, that another Amendment had been made, by the substitution of the words "Roman Catholic," for "Papist," as the latter had been considered as a term offensive to some persons of that persuasion. He hoped their Lordships would have no objection to the Amendment; and he was understood to say, that it would have been made at an earlier period, if a noble Duke, a member of that faith, had thought it worth while to have the alteration made.

The Amendments agreed to.

REFORM.] Lord *Suffield* presented a Petition from the Inhabitants of the Ward of Aldgate, in the City of London, praying for Reform in Parliament, and for the Repeal of the Assessed Taxes. He agreed with the petitioners as to the necessity of reform and retrenchment; and he would take that opportunity of saying that he gave the Ministers his support, with perfect confidence that they would act according to their declarations on those subjects. Much had been said on the question of Reform, to which he was as favourably disposed as any man in the House; so favourably, indeed, that on the very first time he took his seat, he had declared, with more zeal than discretion, that he never would give his support to any Administration which opposed that measure: and he, therefore, was glad that the time had arrived when he could give an Administration, pledged to reform, his general support. As long as the present Ministers acted up to their professions he would support them, and he had the fullest confidence that they meant to carry their promises into effect.

Petition laid on the Table.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Thursday, Dec. 16.

MINUTES.] The Committee on the St. Mawes Election reported, that the right of Election was in the Mayor, Portreeve, and Burgesses paying scot and lot; also in the Freeholders having registered in the Manor Court. They found further, that the two sitting Members had been duly elected.

Bills. The Consolidated Fund Bill was read a second time. Mr. LITTLETON brought in his Bill for Consolidating the Laws prohibiting the payment of Wages in Goods or otherwise than in the current Coin of the realm.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. HOBHOUSE, all the Houses empty at any time in the parish of St. James, from the year 1819 to 1829, and the Rents of such Houses: On the Motion of Mr. WILKS, the Baptisms, Burials, and Marriages, from the year 1813 to 1829, both inclusive, in the several Churches and Chapels of the Established Church throughout the United Kingdom; with other information relative to the state of the Registers in different Parishes.

Petitions presented. For the continuance of the Bounties on Fish, by Mr. M. FITZGERALD, from the Fishermen of Corkaguinny. For the extension of the Elective Franchise of Galway to Catholics, by Mr. J. SMITH, from the Freeholders of Galway:—By Mr. HOBHOUSE, from the Vicarage of Mayres, in the County of the Town of Galway. By the same hon. Member, from Charles Dunne, a Member of the College of Physicians, praying for improved Regulations for the Protection of Lunatics—to secure to them in Asylums a greater number of attending Physicians than they had at present, and that a certain number of medical men be appointed on, and essential to, all Juries sitting in consequence of Writs *de lunatico inquirendo*. By Mr. EWART, from the Jews of Liverpool, for a Removal of the Disabilities under which they labour. For the abolition of Colonial Slavery, by Mr. B. CARTER, from Portsmouth and Portsea:—By Mr. WILKS, from Lyme Regis, Dorsetshire:—By Mr. S. JERNINGHAM, from Cossey:—By Lord ACHESON, from two places in Suffolk:—By Mr. F. PALMER, from Reading. By Mr. WILKS, from Boston, for the repeal of the Assessed Taxes, and for Reform. By Mr. O'CONNOR, from some place in the County of Roscommon, against further Grants to the Kildare-street Society. By Mr. STRUTT, from Derby, in favour of Parliamentary Reform.

CARRICKFERGUS ELECTION PETITION.] Sir *R. Inglis* said, a petition had been presented against this election on the 15th of November, purporting to be signed by certain freemen of the borough. He now held in his hand a petition from the same place, in which it was stated, that eighteen of thirty names subscribed to the former petition were forgeries, being neither signed by the parties, nor by any one authorized to attach their signatures to the document. One name attached to the petition was alleged to be altogether fictitious. The House would see, that this was a matter touching its privileges, and the right of the subject to petition, very nearly; and he should, therefore, give notice, that he would to-morrow move that this Petition be referred to a Select Committee. In adopting this course he was actuated solely by public considerations, being entirely unconnected with the politics of the place.

SELECT VESTRIES.] Mr. *Hobhouse* presented a Petition which, he had to state, was most numerously and respectably signed—it was from the Freeholders of the parish of St. James, in the city of Westminster. It complained of a great grievance—it complained of the deprivation of an important national right—the loss of which had occasioned much and serious discontent throughout many parishes of the metropolis, and in various parts of the country. The grievance of which the petitioners complained was, the existence in their parish of a self-elected

Vestry; and they prayed that some measure might be adopted, consistent with the Report of the Committee which sat during two Sessions of Parliament. He was anxious to take the earliest opportunity of stating, that on the very first day after the recess he meant to bring in a Bill, the object of which would be, to remedy the evils which formed the subject of the present complaint. The Bill he intended to bring in would be modelled upon the former bill, or rather, would be an exact counterpart of it, in the form it had been presented in and before it underwent the amendments of a committee. He had conferred with his constituents on this subject, and they had declared, that they would rather have no bill at all, than the Bill as amended by the committee. They disliked Mr. Sturges Bourne's bill so much, that they would have nothing to do with any measure framed on its principles. He wished in an especial manner to call the attention of the House to the prayer of the present petition, for such was the indignation which select vestries had excited, that he would not answer for the tranquillity of parishes, if something speedy and decisive were not done, with a view to the modification of the present system. It was right the House should know, that several parishes in the metropolis had resolved not to pay the rates unless the abuse were done away. The people who returned Members to that House had not the smallest control over the parish funds, though they might amount to 70,000*l.* or 100,000*l.* a year. In his opinion, the parishioners ought to have a control over their own funds, and he would support no bill which did not give them that control.

Mr. *Cressett Pelham* thought many of the inhabitants of the metropolis favourable to Mr. Sturges Bourne's bill.

Mr. *Denison* corroborated the statement of the hon. member for Westminster, as to the great and prevailing discontent with select vestries.

Mr. Alderman *Wood* trusted, that the hon. member for Westminster would persevere in the motion of which he had given notice. It was absurd to talk of parliamentary reform so long as parish authorities could tax the people without their consent.

Mr. *Wilks* stated, that the abolition of the select vestry in the parish of Shoreditch was attended with a reduction in the rates of 2*s.*—namely, from 4*s.* 8*d.* to 2*s.* 8*d.* He entirely concurred in the statement, that parochial reform was necessary.

Mr. *Hume* informed the House, that the select vestry of the Parish of St. Mary-le-bone, much to their credit, stated, that they would not offer any opposition to their dissolution; and he would add, that nothing but a confident expectation that the system would be abolished, could keep the people of that parish in their present state of quiet and submission to the existing rates.

Sir *F. Burdett* said, that select vestries were one of the greatest practical grievances of the present day, constituting not only a gross violation of every constitutional principle, but of every principle of common sense. There was something in them so preposterous, that an English House of Commons was called upon to get rid of them at once, and the mode of doing so was perfectly simple: it was by a recurrence to the ancient constitutional principle, that no man was to be taxed without his own consent.

The Petition to be printed.

GRANTS FOR EDUCATION.—THE ELECTIVE FRANCHISE (IRELAND).] Mr. *Wyse*:—I hold in my hand a Petition from the Parish of Rahoon, in the town of Galway, praying that this honourable House will be graciously pleased to place the Roman Catholic mercantile and trading classes upon an equal footing with the Protestants, in regard to the Elective Franchise, as at present exercised by them in Galway. The grounds on which they pray for this undoubted right, have been already, on several occasions, exposed in so much detail, and listened to with so much sympathy and consideration in this House, that I should be trespassing unwarrantably on its indulgence, by insisting anew upon the arguments. The anomaly stands singly and unaccountably an exception to the provisions of the Relief Bill of 1829; and had it not been marked by the opposition of the late Prime Minister in the upper House, it might be also imagined an exception to the enlightened intentions of its framers. It is time this blot should be wiped off, and his Majesty's present Administration, pledged as they are by former votes, will consult their own consistency and the just claims of the petitioners, by as speedily as possible proceeding to a legislative enactment on the subject. I have also to present from the parishioners of St. Nicholas, in the same town, a Petition upon a subject of more general interest and importance. They pray that the Legislature will, in the allocation of future grants, for the purposes of Irish education, look more closely into facts, and introduce such changes in the existing system, as will render it more conformable to the wants and wishes of the Irish people. Education, as it now exists in that country, is not national; it is doled out, under party restrictions and conditions, through channels and under influences often hostile, seldom in harmony with the general character or necessities of the country. Moral and intellectual instruction can no more tolerate shackles, than commerce or religion. If, indeed, in any instance, it is here that all trade should be free. The results of a similar system of interference in a neighbouring country, Belgium, are well known. There prescribing the mode by which this mental culture was to be administered, too rigorously, and in contrast with the habits of the people, not only did not advance the purposes for which it was intended, but produced other consequences, which an enlightened Government ought surely to have foreseen,—it kept the people in ignorance, and then plunged them into resistance and revolution. It would appear from the statements of this petition, in strict accordance, I may add, with my own personal observation, that a policy calculated in the same school—a wisdom not inferior to that of the king of Holland—has stood between the petitioners and their fair hopes of the intellectual progress of the country. Their utter inutility (a mild name, indeed, for the intolerable abuses of the Charter schools) is now matter of record in the Reports of the Commissioners of Education—but it is not so well known that the system which succeeded, originating, perhaps, in the best intentions, has been productive of scarcely more advantage to the country, from the purposes to which it was subsequently wrested. I give credit to many benevolent persons, for an anxious desire to extend the lights of mental and moral improvement to their fellow-countrymen, but the means they devised were not the means to attain it: they were inadequately acquainted with Ireland and with Irishmen, and the Kildare-street Society mixed up religious discussions with what ought to have been a matter purely civil, and added new fuel to those burning coals of sectarian dissension and rancour, which have been so long the crime and misfortune of Ireland. Several vain efforts were made by the Catholic clergy—by the Commissioners of Education, in 1824 and 1826—and, which I am happy to add, by the Protestant clergy, so early as 1812—and followed up, as far as his opportunities would permit him, by Lord Anglesey, during the short time of his viceroyalty; but the abuse—the acknowledged, the condemned, the attempted to be corrected abuse—still exists, and calls, amongst the loudest of the many loud grievances of the country, for a searching and immediate cure. It was with this view that I gave, some time since, a notice of a substantive motion for the reform of education in Ireland;—a reform in which I may safely indulge the hope, that I shall meet the earnest co-operation of his Majesty's present Government. When that occasion shall arrive, I shall enter at length into all the bearings of the subject, with a view to some general and final adjustment, satisfactory to all denominations and classes in the country. I have touched only on the principal heads at present, in compliance with the wishes, and in justice to the claims, of the petitioners. I have to add to the petition just presented, another, to which I hope I may be for some moments permitted to entreat the attention of the House. It is a petition of certain holders of chattel-leases or derivative letters thereunder, householders, and others, in Ireland, praying an extension of the right of voting to such as hold such interests. The disfranchisement of the 40*s*. freeholders deprived at once of their vested rights nearly 300,000 voters—a dealing with vested rights against which scarcely a murmur was heard in this House. Whatever may be its consequences in other particulars, I hope it will convey, at least, this healing with the wound it has inflicted—that in the discussions which are yet to take place in this House on reform, hon. Members will remember the precedent, great, and searching, and universal as it was, and when the day of borough disfranchisement shall come, they will hold the balance steady, and wield the axe well, and suppress the tender morality and constitutional qualms of proprietors—those holders of the conscience and character of dependents—by pointing to the 300,000 disfranchised voters,—the "deserted franchise" of the people of Ireland. The petitioners do not petition for a repeal of that measure, however narrowing the constituency, or accompanied with evils of a peculiar nature, arising from the distressed state of Ireland—a distress enhanced by the sudden revulsion and numerous ejectments produced by this law; but they point out a remedy,—a remedy, in my mind, most efficient,—a remedy simple and clear,—for it deals with claims which are unquestionable, and with classes whose competency and respectability cannot be suspected. To extend the right of voting in Ireland to chattel interests would enlarge the constituency to a reasonable measure,—it would infuse a wholesome portion of popular vigour into the franchise, and remove a ground of legitimate grievance and complaint. What entitles the freeholder holding on lives to higher constitutional privileges than the holder of chattel interests? — an antiquated prejudice, arising out of a by-gone frame of society, but in no sort of accord with the real merits of the claim on the existing pretensions of the individual. I do trust and hope to see some extensive alteration in this important point. If the object of all legislative enactments on the subject be, or ought to be (I regret that in fact they are not often found together) to give a better guarantee to the country for the independence of the electoral body—surely there cannot for a moment exist a question that a man who holds for a good term of years, has a far better ground for such independence, than the dependent on an old life of seventy or eighty (I speak of Ireland), which may drop off the very day after an election. That such things happen is notorious—that their effect is to chain the 10*l.* freeholder as much as the 40*s.* freeholder, to the chariot of his lord, is more notorious still. It always appeared to me, that the Disfranchisement bill, even for its avowed purposes, was inadequate. It was inconsistent with itself. What it did intend to effect, it did not effect; what it did not intend to effect, it has fully effected. At the same time, the results to the popular cause have been far more favourable than were expected. In the late elections these results were conspicuous. But they did not arise from the raising of the qualification, they arose from the preponderance of town voters over the rustic constituency; wherever such towns did not exist, the result was nearly the same as before the Disfranchisement bill had taken place. The 10*l.* freeholders are quite as dependent as the 40*s.* had deemed themselves before. The remedy is, therefore, in a more stable tenure; and, under this principle, should come the extension to the holders of chattel interests the right of voting. Such interests are common in Ireland; I believe still more common here. Whether it would not enlarge the franchise too much in this country, I do not pretend to say; but this I may safely assert, that such extension could very easily be balanced; and that in Ireland, at all events, such a result ought to be hoped for, and not be feared. In the arrangements of the great projected measure of parliamentary reform I do hope that this change may have a place. Ireland has much to complain of in a limited constituency—but in a limited Representation still more; 100 Members, with various drawbacks and claims to prevent attendance, are too few. When the franchise (it is hoped) is about to be extended to the great unrepresented towns of England, why not double the Representatives of the chief commercial towns of the sister country? Belfast, Limerick, Waterford, have surely as much want, and as good claim to such a representation, as the numerous insignificant boroughs of the south of England. If balance in numbers be sought, we can spare a certain number of rotten boroughs too. The same observation may extend to Scotland, and perhaps to Wales. I am the more anxious to take this opportunity of urging these remarks, from having observed, that Ireland is not comprehended in the returns moved for by the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Whether this was intentionally intimating that Ireland was not to be comprehended in his plan of reform, I cannot say. I should hope that Ireland has not been excluded from her claim to correction. Should this be the case, she will, I am sure, assert her claim to correction also; and it will become the duty of some of the Irish Representatives, by moving for similar returns, to bring her condition under the notice of the House.—On the Motion that the Petition be brought up,

COBBETT'S REGISTER.] Mr. *Trevor* said

he wished to put a question to an hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (his Majesty's Attorney General) respecting a well-known periodical publication, which contained some paragraphs of a very dangerous character, alluding to the disgraceful scenes now going forward in some parts of the country, and calculated to aggravate the present lawless state of some counties. The publication to which he referred was one that was circulated very extensively, and that laboured unceasingly in efforts of excitation—efforts that, if not arrested in their progress, would, sooner or later, destroy that and the other House of Parliament. The circulation of that diabolical publication—he could find no milder term; the circulation he would repeat was dangerously extensive. It was a compilation which he could not but regard with the utmost regret and alarm [*cries of read, read! name, name.*]

The *Speaker* wished to learn, whether the question which the hon. Member intended to put, had anything at all to do with the present Motion, which was, that a certain petition be brought up? However unwilling to intercept any question, the House must feel that the observations of the hon. Member must conclude with a motion, and surely no other motion could, with any regularity, be allowed to interrupt that then before the House.

Mr. *Trevor* would reduce his question to a few words. He wished to know, if the publication referred to had come under the notice of the hon. and learned Gentleman, the Attorney General, and whether he intended to do anything relative to it [*cries of "name."*] The publication was *Cobbett's Register.*

The *Attorney General* said, he had to thank the hon. Member for his courtesy in sending him a note, intimating his intention of putting the question which the House had just then heard; but since the receipt of that note, he had not had time to read the publication referred to.

Mr. *Trevor* would to-morrow bring the matter under the notice of the House.

Petition to lie on the Table.

Reform in Church and State.] Mr. *Hume* presented a Petition from Southampton, complaining of general Distress, and praying for Reform and Retrenchment. The hon. Gentleman stated, that the petition had been confided to him, because the electors of Southampton could no longer place confidence in their own Members, who had made pledges to them, but had not redeemed them. He was extremely happy to have the honour of presenting this petition, as he looked upon it in the light of a species of reform, to choose a Member of that House who would do his duty, when they could not trust to those who represented the place. This petition was signed by 1,649 individuals, and was almost unanimously agreed to at the meeting where it was proposed. The petitioners complained of the pressure of tithes, of the manner in which they were exacted, and of their inequality. They also pointed out the many evils which were entailed on the country by the Poor-laws. They prayed for a reform in Parliament, and the most rigid retrenchment. The petitioners also called the attention of the House to the abuses which had crept into the Church; among which they stated, that the Rector of St. Mary's, Southampton, received 2000*l.* per annum from that rectory, and 1000*l.* as the head-master of a public school; and that he did the duties of neither office, but lived in another county. They also pointed out the case of a clergyman who received 1,600*l.* a year from a neighbouring parish, in which he did not reside. These were adequate causes for the prevailing discontent. He trusted that this petition would meet with more attention from Government than many other petitions of a similar nature had received.

Mr. *Hoy* complained of the statement of the hon. Gentleman in saying, that he had lost the confidence of his constituents. The fact was, that the petition which had been presented was one proposed as an Amendment by one lawyer, and seconded by another. When he mentioned the profession of these gentlemen, he did not do it invidiously, but only to show that at all events they were not persons of first-rate consequence in Southampton. It was likewise worthy of notice, that one of these gentlemen had been agent to his opponent at one election, and the other had written to him (Mr. Hoy) requesting to be employed at the late election, with which request, however, he had not complied; besides which, he thought that if the hon. Gentleman would take the trouble to inquire, he would find that the petition was by no means signed by the majority of the electors of Southampton. He also assured the hon. Member, that he had given as independent votes as any ever given by the member for Middlesex, and that he despised not more the man who voted always at the will of a patron, than him who voted with a view to what might occur to affect his popularity at the next election. The hon. Gentleman, however, was very fond of setting himself up as the censurer of the whole House, lecturing every person on his course of conduct. He thought the hon. Member had no right to take another to task for the votes he gave. He had taken on himself to tell them that he would have no Minister of State in the House; next, he would have no East-India Director, no Bank Director—in short, he would have no director there but himself. Nor was this the only course he adopted in his search after popularity; like a true Indian sportsman, he shot at everything, from an elephant to a snipe, setting himself up as redresser-general of grievances, and receiver-general of petitions. He (Mr. Hoy) did not pretend himself to be able to compete with the hon. Gentleman, but he could not help wishing that some sarcastic giant would arise, or that this political Quixote, in some of his numerous sallies to redress real or imaginary grievances, would tilt against some windmill, and then his only task would be to write his epitaph, which should be—

"Procumbit humi Bos."

Mr. *Hume* said, that the hon. Member could not have paid him a higher compliment than calling him the redresser of wrongs. It was to redress the wrongs of the people that he came to that House, and he could assure the hon. Member that none of those who laughed at his joke were more pleased with it than he was. As to the respectability of the petition, he should leave the hon. Gentleman to settle that question with his constituents. This he knew, that it was signed by the Mayor, and delivered to him by the Mayor's brother. With respect to his courting popularity, he knew that no instance could be cited in support of such a position, and he would give the hon. Gentleman, and the right hon. member for Armagh, who had so heartily cheered him, a week to think of an instance. That the right hon. Gentleman should have cheered the attack that had been made upon him did not surprise him; for he had ever shown himself the patron of every abuse that had been brought forward, and the perpetual and interminable supporter of every corruption. If, however, what had fallen from the hon. Gentleman had afforded amusement to the House, he had no objection. All he had to complain of was, that the House should think so much of sarcasm and folly, and be so insensible to the real business of the nation.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, that as he had been appealed to, he would mention one of the cases where the hon. Gentleman had not always shown himself impelled by that feeling for which he had been so ready to take credit. In citing that instance, he would go no further back than to almost the last transaction of the last Session of Parliament. It was well known that he (Mr. Goulburn) had last Session brought forward a measure for throwing open the trade in beer. On the first discussion of that measure, the hon. Gentleman had concurred in the proposition; but in a subsequent stage of the bill he had recorded his vote against it. It was true, that between the first proposal of the measure, and the period of that vote, the hon. Gentleman had become a candidate for the county of Middlesex; but he would not take on himself to say what influence that circumstance might have had on the transaction.

Mr. *Warburton* said, that when this charge had been brought against his hon. friend, he thought that he (Mr. Warburton) had given a full confutation of it; for he had stated, from his own certain knowledge, that his hon. friend had entertained doubts on the subject many weeks before that vote was recorded, and long before he had any idea of becoming a candidate for Middlesex.

Mr. *Hoy* said, the hon. member for Middlesex had taken to himself personally what he had intended in a general sense. He could assure the hon. Member that he should willingly bear his testimony to the indefatigable zeal with which he acted in what he conceived to be for the interest of the country.

Mr. *Maberly* said, he rose to answer one of the most unfair attacks he had ever heard made. The right hon. member for Armagh had last Session received the same explanation that his hon. friend (Mr. Warburton) had furnished to the House now. He was able able to state, that the hon. member for Middlesex had made up his mind to vote as he did, before he even thought of becoming a candidate for Middlesex. It was, therefore, a most unfair charge, to impute such a motive to the hon. Gentleman.

Mr. *Goulburn* appealed to all who had heard him, whether the first attack had not been on the part of the hon. member for Middlesex? Till that attack had been made, he had taken no part in the debate beyond cheering what had fallen from the hon. member for Southampton: on account of that cheer, the hon. member for Middlesex had thought proper to say that he was the patron of every abuse that was ever brought forward. The hon. Gentleman had challenged him to mention one instance of his inconsistency; and he had therefore stated what had occurred on the Beer bill, of course leaving it open to explanation, if it was susceptible of it.

Sir *John Newport* deprecated one hon. Gentleman imputing motives to another hon. Gentleman.

Petition to be printed.

Evesham Election.] The Marquis of *Chandos*, in rising to make a Motion on this subject, said, that the Committee appointed by the House had unseated the Members that were returned, on the ground of bribery; and with this charge before the House, he certainly thought that they were bound to consider whether a new election should be allowed to take place. The evidence before the committee had not yet been printed; but, at all events, it was known that that committee had decided against the two Members on the ground of corruption; and this, he contended, was enough to call for the interference of the House, when it was proposed to intrust the borough again with the right of returning Members. All that he at present asked was, that a short time should be allowed for the printing of the evidence, in order that the House might judge for itself; and he should therefore move, that the Speaker do issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown, to make out a *supersedeas* to the Writ that had been issued for the election of two Members for the borough of Evesham.

Lord *George Lennox* seconded the Motion, and called the attention of the House to a paper signed Edward Protheroe, jun., in which that gentleman made the following statement:—"I plainly acknowledge my desire to renew our connection. There is no inconsistency in this. With you, gentlemen, I never had the slightest cause of dissatisfaction: it was with the old system of your borough, with that unjust system which, after faithful and diligent services, accompanied by manly independence and disinterestedness in every speech and every vote, left me no hope of being re-elected, unless I condescended to traffic for my seat with those who bartered your privileges."—When such a declaration as this was made by a gentleman who was well acquainted with the transactions of the borough, he thought that the House had pretty good evidence before it of what was the real state of the case; and he therefore trusted, that Evesham would be disfranchised, and the representation given to some more worthy place. He begged, however, to say, that he himself personally knew nothing of Evesham, nor had he any acquaintance with the two gentlemen against whom the committee had decided.

Mr. *Bolton Clive* considered, that as the committee had not reported the whole borough as guilty of bribery, a case could not be made out for disfranchising it. If the question were, whether the franchise should be transferred from a small to a large town, he knew how he should vote, but the case was different. There were 426 voters for the borough, of whom only 141 were resident; 235 were living at a distance of twenty miles from the borough, a great many of whom were very respectable persons; only twenty-two were proved to have been bribed. In moving the writ, he did what he conceived was his duty, and hoped he had not acted irregularly. It was not regular, he believed, to allude to the manner in which individuals had voted in the committee, and therefore he would not say on what occasion he had given the casting vote to which an allusion had formerly been made. He did not rise to offer any opposition to the motion before the House, but he did not think that a case could be made out for the disfranchisement of this borough.

Mr. *Littleton* said, that he had always been a friend to the disfranchisement of corrupt boroughs, and in some cases had even taken an active part; he must, however, confess, that in this instance he was far surpassed by the noble Marquis, whose new-born zeal for Parliamentary Reform had induced him to make this motion. He was, however, bound to say, that with respect to the present case, he thought that they would be acting unwisely if they established such a precedent; for the report did not contain an accusation of general bribery, but only against the two Members that had been returned.

Mr. *Ross* said, that it was one thing to deal with the question what should be done with respect to a report relating chiefly to the sitting Members, and another as to what should be done with the borough. He would take the liberty of citing some precedents, which he considered would justify the House in adopting the Motion which had been introduced. The first case was that of the borough of Barnstaple. In that borough there were 460 voters; five individuals of whom received bribes, and the House thought proper to investigate that case. In the case of Penryn, eight individuals were reported to have received bribes, and the House proceeded to examine into that. But the hon. Gentleman had stated, that in no instance had the House investigated a case unless the committee had reported against a borough, and recommended the House to inquire as to the manner in which the elections had been conducted in it. The case of Penryn, in 1819, was very similar to the one now brought before the House. The committee reported, that one of the sitting Members had been guilty of bribery; and a similar charge was brought against the Members returned for Evesham, and the report of the committee, therefore, assumed the character of a special report, so far as respected that part of it. In the case of Camelford, the committee reported, that Mr. Stewart had acted in violation of the Bribery Act, and then merely stated, that six individuals had corruptly endeavoured to procure the return of a Member for Camelford. In both these cases, the writs were suspended, and an inquiry instituted, and therefore it did not appear necessary that a report should be presented against the borough of Evesham, in order to afford sufficient grounds for the House to investigate the case. In the instances he had referred to, the House was called on, not only to suspend the writs, but to disfranchise the boroughs. In Evesham there were 426 voters, and of course they did not all vote for the sitting Members; but it had been proved that every one of the non-resident voters who did vote were bribed. Every one of them actually received a bribe. On these grounds he would support the Motion of his noble friend for superseding the writ, which would give the House an opportunity to inquire.

Mr. *Tennyson* thought no case to justify the Motion had been made out, either by the noble Mover or the hon. Member who spoke last. He put it to the House whether the case, as it stood, could justify suspending the writ. In the other cases referred to, the Chairman of the Committee had been instructed to move for the suspension of the writ; but that had never been done, unless at the instance of a committee. As the hon. Member had observed, that was not the case with the present committee. The House, too, had agreed the other evening to issue the writ; and it would not be very judicious now to suspend its own order. All the persons convicted of taking bribes amounted only to twenty-two out of 426 voters; they were all out-voters, and formed a very small minority. In the case of East Retford, it was proved, that a very large majority of the electors complained of were corrupt. They were proved to be corrupt, not at the last election, immediately before the investigation, but at several former elections, and it was proved that they were a great mass of corruption. The House in that case suspended the writ, and entertained a bill to disfranchise the borough. In the case of East Retford, it was not a single act of bribery and corruption at one election which was proved, but a gross case extending through several elections, and not proved to exist at the last. There was long-continued corruption. Here there was nothing like that. He should object, however, to the Motion, because now there was an Administration formed which had given a distinct and positive pledge to investigate the state of the representation, with a view to amend it. He was disposed to place full confidence in that pledge, and to believe that the Ministers would persevere in that course. If the borough of Evesham required correction and excision, he would leave it to the Ministers to inquire and correct it. When he saw whence the present Motion proceeded, and recollected that the Gentlemen who supported it had last Session supported the motion respecting Bassetlaw, he could not avoid suspecting their motives. The hon. Gentleman who spoke last had always opposed the motion for disfranchising East Retford, and therefore he must have some doubts as to the consistency of his present opinions. If the hon. Member wanted to establish another Bassetlaw, that itself would be with him a reason for objecting to the Motion, and would operate, he hoped, with the House to refuse the Motion of his noble friend. He trusted that one of the first measures of the new Government would be, to rescind the bill for transferring the franchise to Bassetlaw. He did not know any measure by which the House of Commons had so disgraced and degraded itself in the eyes of the country as by its conduct on that occasion. He could now speak of that House in the manner it deserved, for it was, he thanked God, gone. Even the right hon. Baronet opposite obtained no credit for his conduct on that occasion, and it contributed, he believed, to the overthrow of his Administration. There was now a prospect of general Reform, and he, therefore, was not disposed to angle with the noble Lord for his *minima* of reform, and he hoped the House would reject the measure.

Sir *George Staunton* said, that he had been a member of the committee, and contended that a gross case had been made out, which called for the severest censure of the House. The Report of the Committee had turned out the Members on account of corruption. At least, the writ ought to be superseded to enable the House to inquire. He had good reason to believe that corruption was common at Evesham, and the present opportunity should be embraced to bring to a test the opinions of the House on Reform. In common, he believed, with almost all men, (nobody objecting to punish a case of delinquency, not even the most violent opponents of general Reform,) he was disposed to disfranchise every sinning borough, and transfer its privileges to some one of the large unrepresented towns of the country. He could not agree with the hon. Member who spoke last, that this subject ought to be deferred, because the general question of Reform was to be discussed; for they knew neither when the Government would bring forward the subject, nor what measure it would propose.

Lord *John Russell* meant, in the few words he should address to the House, to confine himself to the narrowest limits. He should not enter into the general question of Reform, nor assert that it would be improper to assent to the Motion, because the House had already ordered the writ to issue. There were many rights to be considered before the House resolved to suspend the writ. An inquiry should be instituted, and evidence received, to ascertain if the borough of Evesham were as corrupt as it was represented to be. There were many points which the House ought to investigate; for he had always been of opinion, that the Grenville Act, by the inquiries it instituted through committees, frequently screened cases of bribery, and prevented them from being so frequently brought before the House as they were before that Act was passed. The opinions of Election Committees were often, he thought, an obstacle to those inquiries which the House was bound to make into cases of corruption. The question, however, before the House, was not whether an inquiry should now take place into the corruption of the borough of Evesham, but whether the issuing of the writ should be suspended or not? The circumstances of the case were these:—That after an inquiry by a committee, that committee had not given the Chairman instructions to propose that no new writ should issue. The first thing the House had to look at must be its own precedents. He had looked at the precedents quoted by the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Ross,) and that hon. Gentleman could not deny that there were numerous precedents of the allegation of bribery made against Members, and yet the writs for those places had issued. There was no instance of a committee reporting merely against the sitting Members, and on that report the House suspending the writ. To justify that, there must be some special report against the electors. It was only said by some of the Members who composed the election committee, that the case implied further corruption; but that must be made a matter of special report before the House could be able to act upon it. The precedents, then, were many in favour of issuing the writ. At the same time, he admitted, that the House was not to be slavishly bound by the precedents of former times, though it was proper and right that the House should always presume, unless something very strong could be urged against it, that the precedents of former times were founded in reason and justice. By the resolution of the committee it appeared, that corruption had been proved in the borough of Evesham; but, as his hon. friend had observed, it did not extend over the whole borough, though, whether it were confined to the twenty-two voters who had been convicted, or extended to more, it was impossible to say.

The noble Lord who seconded the Motion thought the corruption was general, and seemed to argue that the House was bound to disfranchise the borough; but the Chairman of the committee seemed to think the corruption only partial, and not to deserve disfranchisement. He was at a loss to say, from the report before the House, whether the borough was so corrupt as to deserve disfranchisement or not. Till that was proved, he thought it was consistent with reason and precedent, that the House should not suspend the writ. The House had generally issued writs as a matter of course, they only conferring on the people the power of exercising their rights. That was due to the electors, and due to the House, which had generally proceeded on the principle that Representation ought to be as complete as possible. Principle, then, as well as precedent, was in favour of issuing the writ. To suspend the writ would be a strong measure, and one for which he did not yet see a sufficient reason; but if any stronger reasons than he had yet heard should be advanced, and it should appear to be due to the character of the House, neither he nor his noble friend, he believed, would oppose any obstacles to the Motion. He certainly wished to know accurately the state of the case, but he did not see how that would be promoted by the Motion. In the last Parliament the writ for East Retford was suspended for three years, and he recollected, that the right hon. Baronet opposite then stated, and he fully agreed in the statement, that such a course was not to be followed, but avoided. He recollected also that his noble friend, now the Lord Chancellor, felt, and stated, the strongest objection to that course of proceeding, and frequently supported a motion for the issuing of the writ. In general, it would be very inconvenient to withhold the issuing of a writ, even though an investigation was going on. He begged the House to pause at least, and not to act upon any impulse, but proceed with due deliberation. He meant to leave the question to be disposed of as the House thought fit.

Sir *R. Peel* admitted, that the noble Lord had placed the question fairly before the House, and had discussed it with that same candour which always distinguished his parliamentary conduct; and he felt confident, from the candour of the noble Lord, that he should convince the noble Lord that a *supersedeas* of the writ ought to take place. He agreed with the noble Lord that the considerations urged by the hon. member for Blechingly should be put out of the question. The House ought not to allow any decision as to the general question of Reform, nor any discussion as to what was to be done, if the Borough were disfranchised, to interfere with the present Motion. The question was, whether the House had evidence before it sufficient to prevent the issuing of the writ, and whether they should call upon the people who had been corrupt at the last election to send two other Members to that House? That was the single question before the House, and the objections urged to it were threefold:—first, there was the objection of the hon. member for Staffordshire, that to suspend the issue of the writ would have a tendency to interfere with the provisions of the Grenville Act, and diminish the power of Election Committees. That argument had no foundation. The election committee had chiefly to decide between the sitting Members and the candidates; and as far as they were concerned, the decision of the committee was final. If the House were to interfere with the suspension of the writ, that would not be dealing with the decision of the election committee. The report of that committee related to the sitting Members, Lord Kennedy and Sir Charles Cockerell; but the committee had also made a special report, as the noble Lord had stated. The ordinary report was, that Lord Kennedy and Sir Charles Cockerell were not duly elected. That was the ordinary report, on which their exclusion was founded. Appended to that, however, was another report, which stated, that Sir Charles Cockerell, or his agent, had been guilty of bribery, and that several of the electors had suffered themselves to be bribed. That was the Special Report. The Grenville Act did not make the special report binding on the House; but it said, that if the committee which is appointed to determine the rights of sitting Members shall instruct its chairman to make a special report to the House, the House may conform to or disagree from the Resolution of the Committee, and make such an order as it liked. If the House adopted any Order, or refused to adopt it, contained in any special report, it would only be acting in conformity with the principle laid down by the House of Commons;

and, therefore, he considered the objection, of the hon. Member of no force. The next argument was that of the noble Lord, who had referred to precedents, but stated, in which he agreed, that these precedents, though generally founded in reason, were not to be slavishly followed. He would put it to the noble Lord, if the precedents he should quote would not make the noble Lord admit that the writ ought not to issue. Two precedents might be referred to—those of Penryn and Camelford, In the Penryn case, the special report stated, that John Goodeve, Henry Durnsford, and Abraham Winn had been guilty of corrupt practices, and Henry Parker, and seven other electors, had received bribes to induce them to give their votes. There was no imputation of general corruption. There were three persons accused of attempting bribery; and eight others accused of receiving bribes! and it was thought by the House of Commons, that it was sufficient to justify suspending the writ that only eight persons had been guilty of bribery; that was the Penryn precedent. In the case of Evesham, though there was no special report, it was stated, that twenty-two persons received bribes. If in Penryn there were only eight persons bribed, and if, as it could not be doubted, that twenty-two were bribed in Evesham, ought the House not to conclude that the issuing of the writ ought to be suspended in the case of Evesham as in the case of Penryn? The House should consider that the motion was not to suspend the writ indefinitely, but only till the evidence should be laid before the House. Would it be decent even, to give those who had been guilty of corrupt practices the power to renew them, till the House had read the evidence. In the case of Camelford, what was the special report? That John Stewart had acted in a corrupt manner, and been guilty of bribery, and was incapable of sitting; and that John Rounsevel, and four other electors, had corruptly endeavoured to procure the return of two Members to serve in Parliament for Camelford. In this case there were only five voters corrupt, and yet the House of Commons suspended the writ. There was no general allegation of corruption. Here, then, were two precedents of suspending the issue of the writ—clear cases; and would not the House, therefore, suspend issuing the writ for Evesham, in which twenty-two voters had been guilty of corrupt practices, and had accepted bribes, only till the House had read the evidence? The noble Lord must see, that the precedents were not in his favour, and were in favour of withholding the writ. If the noble Lord would reject precedents, and try the case by the principles of common sense and reason, he would probably come to the conclusion, that the writ ought not to be issued. Could there, in fact, be any doubt on the subject? One hon. Gentleman had stated, that corruption had been the inveterate practice of the borough for fifty years. In his opinion, among the out-voters the practice was general. They had the testimony, too, of an hon. Member, who had stated, that he had relinquished his connexion with the borough, because he could not conscientiously consent to the demands for bribes made on him. That was in evidence before the House; and did not, then, good sense and reason say, that the writ ought to be suspended till the House could institute a full inquiry into all the circumstances? Was it, in fact, possible to hesitate under such circumstances? The hon. Gentleman indeed said, let the House consider that we have now an Administration pledged to Reform, and let it leave to that the task of inquiring. Admitting that we have such an Administration, he must deny that the Government was competent to inquire into all the peculiarities of resident and out voters. Was it fit that the House should delegate to the Ministers the propriety of deciding the elective franchise of this borough, and of determining, to use a phrase of the hon. Member, which he had well remarked and remembered, on the propriety of excising the borough itself? If it were to be done, let it be done by an inquiry instituted at that bar, and not done by a private inquiry instituted by his Majesty's Ministers. The Government was not fit to institute such an inquiry—it could not receive evidence, and he did not know any plan more likely to be productive of injustice to the parties, than for the Government to undertake the inquiry. On the ground, then, of the Grenville Act—on the score of precedents, and on the principles of good sense, and reason, and justice, it would be wise to order a suspension of the writ till the evidence was before the House. With reference to the new-born zeal with which the hon. and learned Gentleman taunted him, he must state, he was not obnoxious to the hon. and learned Gentleman's remarks. The hon. and learned Gentleman's motion was not opposed by him; on the contrary, he supported that motion, and was satisfied with much less evidence than others, both in the cases of Penryn and that of East Retford, that the writ ought not to issue. He had always contended that the franchise was given for a public purpose, and that the House had a right to dispose of it when that would benefit the public. He had taken no part in any former Debate that should preclude him, on any fit occasion, from transferring a franchise from a corrupt borough to Birmingham or any other large unrepresented town. In the Penryn case, he had been willing to transfer that franchise to Manchester. Upon the former occasion he had been asked what course he would pursue in any future case of delinquency on the part of a borough. He had declined to answer that question, declaring that he would act on every occasion as the circumstances of the case required. He had reserved himself at full liberty to give the franchise to great towns on any fitting occasion. He was not, however, disposed to enter into the general question. He would only ask, whether it would be wise, after the allegation which had been made by the members of the Committee, to intrust again the franchise to a borough which had abused it? He did not call on the House to decide that it should not be intrusted —that was not the question—but to decide that it would not give the trust till it had seen the evidence.

Lord *Althorp* agreed with his noble friend, and the right hon. Gentleman, that this question was to be decided on the narrow ground of precedent; but that precedents were not to be slavishly followed. The House must decide if precedents authorised the suspension of the writ, and it was a matter of some importance that the House should not make a new precedent without due consideration. He did not think that the precedents quoted by the right hon. Gentleman justified the suspension of the writ. He differed from him, because, in the two precedents he had quoted, both the committees had reported against the electors. In the present case, the report of the committee was confined to censuring the Members. The right hon. Gentleman said; that members of the committee complained of the corruption being extended to the electors, but that was only the opinion of individual Members, as the committee decided against a special report. In the other cases quoted by the right hon. Gentleman, the Committees had made special reports; but in those cases where special reports were not made, and only the sitting members were unseated, the House had never thought proper to suspend the writ. It was not necessary for him to quote precedents of the kind from the Journals; they were so numerous, that every Member must know it was continually customary for sitting Members to be unseated by the report of a committee, without the writ being suspended. He did not, however, consider it of any consequence whether the writ were suspended or not; and if it was the opinion of the House that it should be suspended, he for one would not oppose the suspension. In doing this, certainly it was his opinion that they would act against precedents, and it was neither desirable nor necessary that the House should make any new precedents. He did not see any great necessity for issuing it, and he owned that he did not know that any injury would accrue if it were withheld for a short time. If, therefore, the House were disposed to withhold the writ, he should not oppose the measure.

Mr. *A. Duncombe*, who was a member of the Committee, explained, that the committee had agreed to make a report similar to that made by the East Retford committee. Subsequently, that decision was revised, and the committee were equally divided, when the Chairman gave his casting vote in favour of an ordinary report. There never was a special report resolved on without its leading to a suspension of the writ. He hoped that the House would see the evidence, and not give its sanction to Members being again returned by a place which had been guilty of such corrupt practices. The electors were as corrupt as the elected, and ought to be punished. He did not know why the hon. member for Blechingly should be so ready to attribute improper motives to other hon. Members, unless it was that the hon. Member had been much disappointed, because he was not the sitting Member for Birmingham. He was fully as independent and as upright as the hon. Member, and had no motives of which he was ashamed for his conduct. It was said that there were only twenty-two electors convicted of bribery out of 426; but the reason was, that only twenty-two were brought forward. The object of those who opposed the Members was only to unseat them, and they brought forward no more evidence than was necessary for that purpose. All the electors who were brought forward were convicted of bribery; and if more were not convicted, it was because more were not brought forward. That was sufficient to establish the case, and he should support the noble Lord's Motion.

Mr. *Tennyson* explained, that what he meant respecting the hon. Gentlemen opposite was, that he suspected that it was their intention, of which he could not approve, not to transfer the franchise to a large town.

Mr. *Martin* supported the motion for superseding the writ. He had resided long in the neighbourhood of Evesham, and there could be no doubt that gross corruption had been very general in the borough.

Lord *Morpeth*, following the course which his duty prescribed to him, could not, with the most sanguine wishes for reform, feel himself warranted in voting for the proposition of the noble Marquis. He had, in the course of the debate on the East Retford bill, shown the view which he took on questions of this nature; but there was this peculiarity in the present case—that although the committee had reported the Members to be guilty of bribery and corruption, they made no report that the electors were also corrupt and unfit to exercise their rights. The report of the committee did not inculpate the borough, although it declared the election void from bribery; and therefore he thought that they were not, as in the case of East Retford, called on to exercise that judicial part of their functions, which might have been called into exercise by a different species of report. The resolution of *Supersedeas* which the House was now called on to assert, was, as far as he could understand, produced by a division of opinion among the committee with respect to the Report. The committee, however, having reported as they did, he felt absolved from the necessity of adopting any ulterior measure; and he was the less dissatisfied with that resolution, because the great question of general reform would so soon be determined either in that Parliament or in the next, which would doubtless be immediately called together if the present refused its assent to the measures of reformation which would be proposed to it. For these reasons, and because he felt that the cause of staying the writ was not warranted by any precedent, or called for by any extraordinary circumstances, he should vote if the question went to a vote, for the immediate issue of the writ. If, however, it was the general opinion of the House, that the writ ought not to issue, he should not oppose his individual opinion to the opinion of the House.

Mr. *Warburton* said, that he could see no advantages they were likely to receive from suspending the issue of the writ, and he should certainly vote against the Motion. In a case of much the same kind—that of Stockbridge—he found opinions stated on the subject by a celebrated Member of the House of that day, Sir Phillip Francis, which so perfectly coincided with his own, and were, withal, so perfectly applicable to the case, that he should take leave, as they were very short, to read them to the House. "If," said that hon. Member, "I saw the candidate pay the money down on that table, and the electors take it up, yet I would not vote for the disfranchisement of the borough; for I ask you, how you can take the franchise away from one or two places, when you refuse every proposition for a general reform?" And he adds, that it is better the abuse should become so glaring that the House would be compelled to put an end to it. This was the language held thirty years ago on this subject, and he thought it still worthy of adoption as a principle. On these grounds he should vote against the Motion.

Mr. *Bankes* said, he thought the opinions embraced by the hon. member for Bridport so extraordinary, that they did not require much observation on his part. He would merely say, that if generally adopted, they would go to the extension and encouragement of every conceivable abuse in the system of representation. The noble Lords opposite had stated their opinions with great candour, and he concluded that they regarded the precedents as sufficient to justify the course proposed by the Motion. In his opinion, the arguments relating to the course to be pursued with respect to the borough of Evesham lay in a very narrow compass. They had been very happily stated by the right hon. Baronet; and his precedents of Camelford and Penryn seemed to be so consonant with common sense, that he should not venture to attempt to add any further reason for his agreeing with the Motion of the noble Marquis for staying the issue of the writ.

Sir *G. Warrender* said, he was always happy to agree with the hon. member for Dorsetshire (Mr. Bankes); but, as an elector of the very borough the rights of which were under discussion, he felt himself called on to say a few words in its defence—in defence of the 141 electors against whom no imputation was laid—and in defence of more than 100 of the out-voters, comprehending a vast proportion of the respectable gentlemen in the neighbourhood, and in the county of Worcester, who, like himself, had taken no part in the late proceedings. He was a friend to reform; but he considered the present case offered no precedent for the suspension of the issue of the writ; because, as it had been already well observed by a noble Lord, in all cases where the report of the committee on the petition declared, that the Members were guilty of bribery, but found no case to report on with respect to the electors, the writ immediately issued. In the present case it appeared that the committee had not, on the examination of the evidence, felt themselves warranted in declaring the corruption to be so general as to induce them to recommend the disfranchisement of the independent voters, in consequence of the offences of a few; and he trusted that, under such circumstances, the House would not sanction the adoption of a dangerous precedent.

Mr. *Maberly* did not intend to take any part in the debate; but as he was connected with the borough of Evesham, through one of the candidates, he felt bound to say, that he would not have suggested that proceeding if he had been aware of there being any irregularity in the conduct of the electors.

Mr. *G. Bankes* declared his determination to vote for the proposition of the noble Marquis, and defended himself from any imputation of inconsistency, in consequence of his having acted differently in the case of East Retford, by contending, that the committee had not in that case gone as far as they might have done, or should have done. In every case, however, if there was a briber, there must be a bribee, and it was therefore idle to argue on the difference between a report of the committee, attributing bribery to the Members, and not reporting corruption on the part of the electors.

Mr. *Twiss* thought the precedents were entirely in favour of the Motion, and if it were pressed to a division he should vote for it.

The Marquis of *Chandos* said, that before the House came to a decision on this question he wished to ask the hon. member for Blechingly (Mr. Tennyson) on what grounds he considered his (the Marquis of Chandos) conduct liable to suspicion? The House would do him the justice to recollect, that he had, on every occasion, endeavoured to preserve consistency in the course of politics which his judgment induced him to adopt; and he had at all times laboured to preserve it free from the suspicion of insincerity. He thought he was also entitled to some explanation from the hon. member for Staffordshire (Mr. Littleton), with respect to the charge of a new-born zeal in the cause of Reform. He (Lord Chandos) had always advocated the course which, to his mind, seemed the best, and he should be glad to know how long the hon. Member had himself exhibited a zeal for Reform

Mr. *Tennyson* felt obliged to the noble Lord for allowing him an opportunity to explain any expression which might have given him cause of offence. He at all times entertained great respect for the noble Lord's conduct, both in the House and elsewhere; and he could assure the noble Lord, that nothing was more foreign to his wishes than to offer him any offence. What he had said was, not that the noble Lord's conduct was suspicious, but that he suspected the objects of those who wished for this delay, as being intended to administer the same remedy to the borough of Evesham as they had already adopted with regard to East Retford, and to make it another Bassetlaw.

Mr. *Littleton* said, that as he also had been called on by the noble Lord to explain the meaning of his expressions, he begged to observe, that he did not intend to offend the feelings of the noble Lord, but he might be permitted to say, that during the eighteen years he had held a seat in that House, he had invariably assented to propositions for Reform, and had zealously supported the Motion of a noble Lord (Lord J. Russell) for giving Members to Leeds, Birmingham, and Manchester. He had also expressed his willingness to support the general Motion of the noble Lord on the same subject, if the noble Lord consented to make a slight alteration in his resolutions, and he regretted that the noble Lord was not present to confirm that statement. He could tell the noble Marquis that his zeal in the cause of Reform was not the birth of yesterday. He had merely expressed his surprise that the noble Marquis's opinions differed so much from those they had heard before on similar occasions; but he must again express his regret that his language had given the noble Marquis any offence.

Motion carried without opposition, and it was ordered that Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a *Supersedeas* to the Writ for electing two Members to serve in the present Parliament for the borough of Evesham, in the room of Sir Charles Cockerell and Lord Kennedy. The consideration of the Special Report of the Committee on the Evesham Election was postponed to Feb. 17th.

General Register for Deeds.] Mr. *John Campbell* spoke as follows:—Mr. Speaker,* I rise, in pursuance of the notice I have given, to move for leave to bring in a Bill to establish a General Register for all deeds and instruments affecting Real Property in England and Wales. I should propose a measure of such vast importance with the utmost distrust, if it proceeded entirely from my own opinion of its expediency; but I venture to bring it forward with some confidence, as it is the result of the united labours and the unanimous recommendation of the Commissioners appointed by his late Majesty to inquire into the defects to be found in the law of Real Property in this country, and the improvements of which it is susceptible. Regret has been expressed more than once in this House, that a Gentleman of whose services the world is now for ever deprived,—I mean my late friend Mr. Humphreys,—was not appointed a member of that commission. I can say truly that I joined in that regret, and I willingly take this opportunity of paying a humble tribute to his memory. He was a man, who, with a profound knowledge of his profession, had an enlarged and cultivated mind, and was actuated by an ardent desire to improve the institutions of his country. To him the merit belongs of first drawing the attention of the public to the present defective state of the law of Real Property; and although I could not concur in all his theories for the amendment of it, I should have been well pleased to have had him as a coadjutor in the great undertaking over which I was solicited to preside. But it has been my good fortune to be associated with others of distinguished acquirements and capacity. In the absence of the late Secretary of State, for the Home Department, I may be allowed to say, that I believe in following up the resolution adopted by this House, upon the motion of the present Lord Chancellor, for the appointment of Commissioners to inquire into the law of Real Property, and the practice in the Courts of Common Law, that right hon. Gentleman was actuated only by the desire that the object might be most effectually attained; and I cannot refrain from declaring, as he is now no longer Minister of the Crown, that both from my own official communications with him, and from my general observation of his career, I consider him a sincere, steady and enlightened friend of legal reform. Nothing better can be wished for the improvement of the law, than that those who succeed him may in this respect imitate his example. With respect to Mr. Humphreys, it may be satisfactory to the House and to the country to know, that although not a member of the commission, he generously supported us;—that we derived valuable assistance, not only from his writings, but from personal conferences with him,—and that he was a zealous promoter of a General Register. Sir, this measure is certainly, for good or for evil, one of the most important ever submitted to the attention of the Legislature; and I cannot but lament, that subjects of ephemeral interest, which touch party feelings, generally excite more attention in this House than the discussion of laws which deeply affect the property and the rights of the present and future generations. The House having resolved that the writ for the election of Members for the corrupt borough of Evesham shall be superseded by the Speaker's warrant, and the hour of dinner having arrived, a general dispersion has taken place, and the benches on both sides of the House are nearly deserted. Nevertheless, under such discouraging circumstances, I shall feel it my duty to explain to those hon. Members who honour me with their attention, the grounds on which I think this measure is necessary, and will be found salutary and beneficial. They must be aware that this can only be done by entering into technical details, which no powers of statement or illustration could render amusing. I can truly say, that I commenced the investigation of the subject without having in any way committed myself, and without any preconceived opinion, or even bias, to mislead me; and the result of that investigation is, that a General Register, upon an improved plan, such as I am prepared to propose, would remove many existing evils in the law,—would render the transfer of real property simple, easy, safe and economical,—and would be found a new power, capable of being applied to the most important purposes. I know there are eminent individuals, for whose opinions I am bound to entertain great respect, who consider the present law of real property a system of almost absolute perfection. Such men must condemn any change in it as unnecessary and mischievous. I am not blind to the merits of the old common law of England, which in its machinery for separating the law from the fact, and assigning each to a distinct tribunal, excels every other system which I have studied; but I think it now labours under grievous imperfections, by our adhering to old rules when the reasons for them are gone,—by not adapting our institutions to the altered circumstances of the country, and by forgetting the maxim which ought never to be forgotten,—that Time is the greatest innovator. Such is the present condition of the law, that where real property is to be transferred or charged, titles are generally found to be unmarketable or unsafe; those that are safe are often unmarketable, and those that are marketable are often unsafe. From whence does this insecurity arise? I say, from the want of a General Register, where, by a glance, a knowledge might be obtained of all the deeds and instruments affecting any particular portion of real property, or any interest arising out of it. Without this, no purchaser of an estate, and no person who advances his money on mortgage, can be secure. The title to real property in this, and in every civilized country, does and must depend upon written documents; and unless you are sure that you have knowledge of all the documents in existence, affecting any particular subject of transfer or charge, there is no safety for you. Enact that no man's rights shall be injured by any documents affecting real property which are not registered, and the evil arising from the concealment of such documents is instantly cured. There is an obvious distinction in this respect, between real and personal property. A person in possession of a horse or a bale of goods is generally the absolute owner, or his agent; and a very little inquiry will enable the person disposed to purchase, to find out the person with whom he may safely deal. The title does not depend upon writing; and if there has been a sale, even without the authority of the owner out of possession, his right is gone if that sale was in *market overt*, or by a person whom he intrusted to appear to the world as owner. In experience, the title to personal chattels bought by a *bonâ fide* purchaser, using reasonable diligence, is hardly ever questioned; and no danger is apprehended against which any precaution is ever taken, beyond inquiry of the vendor at the time of sale. There is neither loss to the purchaser from concealed claimants appearing; nor delay, nor expense, nor inconvenience from any apprehended danger in making the transfer. The occupier of land may be tenant at will, or for years, or for life, or in tail, or in fee simple. The interests are almost infinite which may be carved out of one subject-matter, and which may be concurrent, or made to arise one after another. No notice is given of these by apparent possession, and each may be enforced on production of the instrument creating it. A purchaser or mortgagee is liable to be deceived and defrauded under circumstances apparently free from all suspicion. One known to have been owner of the fee simple, by a secret settlement reduces his interest to a life estate, without any apparent change in the enjoyment of the land. The heir at law enters on the death of the ancestor, concealing a will, by which he is made tenant for life only, with remainder to his children or some collateral relation. The father under a power of appointment, in default of which his eldest son takes the fee, by a deed duly executed appoints to the son for life, with remainders over: the deed is concealed, and the son takes possession on his father's death. In each of these three cases, a perfect unsuspicious title to the fee is made out by the suppression of a single instrument. A cautious man buys the estate, or advances money nearly to the value of it on mortgage. On the death of his vendor or mortgager, he is turned out of possession, or loses his security, on the production of the settlement, the will, or deed of appointment,—which makes a case against him in favour of the remainder-man, admitting of no question. So the owner of an estate may now, with a little dexterity, mortgage it several times over, without the mortgagees being able to discover the nature or amount of prior encumbrances: and what is particularly hard, a mortgagee has to dread, not only encumbrances prior, but posterior, to his own; for a third mortgagee, by getting an assignment from the first, is preferred to the second. This, Sir, is called "tacking," or "squeezing." The second mortgagee is squeezed out, the third mortgage being tacked to the first. Is it not a reproach to the law, that there should be terms such as these, which are quite familiar in the mouths of practitioners,—or rather, that the practices should be tolerated which they are employed to designate? Again, by equitable mortgages, which have recently sprung up, and are lauded by some, enormous frauds may be practised. These are effected by a mere deposit of title-deeds. A man may by a trick get possession of his title-deeds, which ought to be in the keeping of another, and then, by skilfully parcelling them out, raise money to a greater amount than twice the value of the estate. Even without any fraudulent intention, from mere inadvertence, according to the present system, deeds are sometimes mislaid and forgotten in families; and being afterwards discovered, they must be enforced for the benefit of infants or married women, to the utter ruin of purchasers or mortgagees. From these causes, I do aver, upon the evidence laid before me, that not only is every purchaser and mortgagee subjected to a painful feeling of insecurity, but that actual loss does not unfrequently arise. I have been asked, why there are not more cases in the law reports, in which purchasers and mortgagees have been defeated by a paramount title. The reason is obvious. When such cases occur, they admit of no doubt, and the purchaser or mortgagee having ascertained the genuineness of the deed, which shows that the vendor or mortgager had only an estate for life, on his death can only yield to the person next in remainder. But there are few Solicitors in considerable practice, who have not known some such instances; many are stated in the Appendix to the Report of the Commissioners; and I can assure the House, that since it was publicly known that I meant to propose this Bill, a considerable number have been communicated to me from different parts of the country. The rights of successive encumbrancers, who have advanced their money in ignorance of existing charges, admit of much more dispute; and the law books are filled with cases respecting them. There are valuable treatises on the subject, deducing rules from these cases with all the pride, pomp and circumstance of classification, subdivision, and analysis. But, Sir, a most inadequate notion would be formed of the evil I seek to remedy, by merely regarding the instances in which loss does actually occur from a defective title. Those instances, comparatively speaking, are rare; but here is the great evil which I wish most anxiously to impress upon the House, and upon the public—that, as the law now stands, loss may occur in every instance, and that insecurity of title is a risk against which precautions must be and are taken in every transaction respecting real property. Hence the intolerable delay, expense and vexation which are experienced, and of which most of those who now hear me must in some measure be aware, as often as land is to be sold, or a sum of money is to be raised upon it. To supply the defective information derived from the deeds produced, all sorts of inquiries are set on foot. Affidavits are required from old persons living in the neighbourhood, land-tax assessments are examined, county histories are referred to, grants from the Crown are hunted up, various public offices are visited, where, perhaps, some information may be obtained respecting debts due to the Crown, the Ecclesiastical Courts are ransacked for wills and administrations, and a round is made of the Courts of Common Law, in a search after judgments. But, with the exception of one very eminent Conveyancer who was examined before us, all who have opposed the establishment of a General Register, have admitted that some expedient is necessary to guard against the suppression of deeds; that mere confidence cannot be acted upon; and that the greatest diligence, without such an expedient, would leave the danger of insecurity too great to be encountered. The expedient at present resorted to is so complicated and subtle, that I almost despair of making it intelligible to the House; but its defects and inconsistencies and mischiefs are such, that they may easily be pointed out to any one, however unacquainted with the science of jurisprudence. There are certain entities, called outstanding terms, or legal estates, which are said to attend and protect the inheritance. They originate in matters wholly unconnected with the security of title. I believe there has been yet no instance of a term being created, that it might be assigned as a protection against mesne incumbrances, although there is no saying to what length the system may be pushed by perverse ingenuity. According to the law of England, terms for years of any duration may be carved out of the inheritance; and whatever their duration may be, they are considered less than a freehold for the life of another; they are treated as personal estate, and they pass to the personal representative, instead of the heir at law. When these terms are once created, the person in whom they are vested is deemed at law to be entitled to the possession of the land, although his title be a mere shadow, and he has no substantial interest. They usually originate in mortgages and marriage settlements. Land is mortgaged for 1,000 years. When the mortgage is paid off, it frequently happens that the term is not surrendered to the owner of the fee, but it is allowed to remain outstanding in the mortgagee or his personal representative, or is assigned to a trustee to attend the inheritance. So by a settlement a term for 500 or 700 years is given to trustees, to raise portions for younger children, or some such family purpose. When the purpose is answered, without some proviso for cessor, the term is still outstanding in the trustees or their representatives; or it is assigned, as before, to a trustee, in whom or whose representatives or assigns, according to the doctrine of Courts of Equity (although Common-law Judges sometimes rule differently) it ought to be considered as vested till it expires by effluxion of time. These terms confer what is called the legal title to the land, the person beneficially entitled, while they are running, having only an equitable estate. Now, if a *bona fide* purchaser or mortgagee, who deals with a person appearing to be owner of the inheritance, can get in one of these terms, it will protect him from all alienations and charges since it was created; for any subsequent alienee or encumbrancer can only have an equitable interest; these equities are supposed to be equal, although accruing successively; and among equal equities, he who has the legal estate prevails. An old term, therefore, is said to supply all the security proposed by a public register, because no prejudice can arise from the suppression of deeds which have been executed since its creation. Is it possible that machinery so complicated, so clumsy, so ill adapted to its object, can work well? Sir, I do not hesitate to express my decided opinion, that outstanding terms are a substantive evil; that instead of palliating, they aggravate the mischiefs arising from our present ignorance of the true state of any title; and that, even if a Register should not be established, they ought all to be swept away. In the first place, let me remind the admirers of outstanding terms as giving security to title, that over full one-half the landed property in England no outstanding term is to be found; for they have nothing to do with beneficial leases, and are only known to exist where an estate has been within a reasonable time in mortgage or settlement. These Gentlemen, to be consistent, should propose an Act of Parliament for the creation of such fictitious estates over the whole realm, — the result of which would be to prefer in every instance the person who last acquired the right, — although a prior party, whose interest has not vested in possession, may have been guilty of no default. But let us take a rapid view of the mischiefs which the existing system of outstanding terms occasions. In the first place, a man now holds his estate by several titles instead of one, and each title must be formally deduced. Your Conveyancer does not like to ride at single anchor. He is not satisfied with one term; he must keep up several, lest one or two may not cover the whole of the premises, or one of them, if very old, may be presumed to have been surrendered, or, if rather modern, may be defeated by a prior term brought forward by another party. By one set of deeds, the title to the fee must be deduced without any reference to the terms as if they had never existed. Then each term must be deduced as if the estate entirely depended upon it; and the assignment of the term is generally a more lengthy instrument than the conveyance of the fee; for it ought, according to the rules of good conveyancing, to trace the title to the fee from the last assignment of the term, in order to show that the term is assigned to the party who is properly entitled to the protection of it, as attending the inheritance. Think of the multiplication of voluminous deeds which this system occasions! But this, though a formidable evil, is as nothing compared with the difficulty, delay, expense, and vexation experienced in finding out the individuals in whom these terms are vested, and obtaining the necessary probates and administrations to make a good title to them. The trustee in whom a term was vested is often found to have been an attorney's clerk, of whom or whose family no trace can be discovered; and there can be no certainty whether he has died intestate, or whether administration may have been granted of his effects. Then there is great danger of miscarriage from the will not being proved, or the administration, whether general or limited to the term, not being granted by the proper jurisdiction. Of all the grievances the people of this country have at present to complain of, this cries the loudest for redress. There are now about 370 Courts which grant probates and administrations. If the probate or administration be taken out in a diocesan or any inferior Court, and the testator left *bona notabilia*, that is, personalty to the value of *5l.*, in another jurisdiction, or if the premises to which the term applies be in another jurisdiction, the probate or administration is absolutely void. I have in my own practice known repeated instances of parties relying on terms being turned round at *nisi prius*, upon the objection that a probate or administration was void. There are now right reverend, noble, and learned Commissioners sitting to inquire into the abuses of the Ecclesiastical Courts. I have the highest confidence in their intelligence and liberality, and I entertain the highest expectations from their labours, which I know to be unremitting. I hope to live to see the day when, for the purpose of proving wills and granting administrations, there shall be no distinction between the provinces of York and Canterbury, or the different dioceses, peculiars, and other districts within those provinces,—when the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts upon this subject (which is wholly unconnected with the Church) shall be taken away, and when there shall be one general Court of probate and administration for the whole of England and Wales. The delay, expense, vexation, and disappointment now experienced in getting in outstanding terms would then be greatly mitigated. But even then these terms, when got in, would not deserve to be much relied upon. The party who has got the term regularly deduced and assigned to his trustee, has formidable dangers to encounter, both in equity and at law, before he can render it available. A Court of Equity says it shall not protect him against any prior encumbrance of which he had notice. Now, notice may be actual or constructive; and the party is supposed to know whatever was communicated to his counsel, attorney, or agent, or is mentioned in any deed submitted to them, or in any deed referred to in such deed, or any fact which he or they might, from what they knew, have been expected to inquire about, and so might have ascertained. Thus, title is made to depend upon loose recollections, and the mistakes and falsehoods of parol testimony. Nay, *lis pendens* is notice, and all the King's subjects are supposed to know the contents of a bill in Chancery, although the suit has been languishing for twenty years. Let us suppose that equity has decreed that the party, as a *bonâ fide* purchaser without notice, is entitled to the benefit of the term; if he carries it into a Court of law, the Judges there will very likely tell the Jury to presume that it was surrendered before the last assignment. The equity Judges have bitterly complained of the common-law Judges for venturing to presume the surrender of a term once assigned to attend the inheritance: but the common-law Judges have persevered in their opinion and their practice; and the poor purchaser can never tell whether, when an ejectment is brought against him, the term, which was so highly prized, and which has cost him so dear, will be of any service to him. Then he never can be sure that an older term may not be set up against him, and through this he may be defeated by a party whose title is posterior to his own. The subsequent purchaser or encumbrancer may have acquired this term by something approaching, but not quite constituting, the offence of burglary, and be still allowed the benefit of it. The hon. member for Weymouth, in one of those publications for which the profession and the public are so much indebted to him, mentions an anecdote of a man, who, in passing a house in which he suspected there was a deed evidencing the existence of an old term he greatly wanted, observed that one of the windows was open, although the door was locked;—whereupon he clapped a ladder to the window, entered the house, found the deed, carried it away, and was held to be entitled to use it against a *bonâ fide* adverse claimant. But every Member who has followed me must already have observed, that this expedient of an outstanding term does not operate in any respect as a guard against fraud, or general protection from loss, and that, with a view to the good of the community, it is utterly worthless; for it never operates for the benefit of one man without detriment to another, and it merely changes the victim who is doomed to suffer. It is familiarly called "*tabula in naufragio.*" The plank will carry but one. If one man wishes to mount it, he must shove off another, who goes to the bottom. Nay, the system works positive injustice. The rule of natural equity is "*qui prior est tempore potior est jure*;" but the rights of contending parties are made to depend upon the accident of which can get a fictitious title, in itself of no value. I ought to observe, that the system, instead of preventing, positively assists fraud; for when a purchaser has a term offered as part of the title, he sometimes abstains from easy inquiries, which would show that the estate had been before charged or sold to another, and he shuts his eyes lest he should see what he suspects to exist. I would finally observe on this part of the subject, that the fortunate or unfortunate person who is adjudged, both at law and in equity, to be entitled to the protection of the term, has at best but a chattel interest instead of the fee, for the reversion is in another; and to the present day it is unsettled, what rights he has under the term during his life, and what interest goes to his heir or personal representative, if he dies intestate. I may be thought to have dwelt at unnecessary length upon this part of the subject, but I can assure the House that if I have succeeded in exposing the futility of the protection alleged to be derived from outstanding terms, I have, *ex concessis*, established the necessity for a General Register. Although to protect purchasers and encumbrances from concealed deeds be the chief object of a general Register, there are other evils now severely felt which it would remedy, supposing the original deeds or authentic copies of them to be deposited in the Register Office. Great facilities might be afforded, and much expense saved, when they are to be given in evidence. At present, title-deeds are not unfrequently lost from being left in solicitors' offices, and from various casualties to which they are exposed. Titles thereby become unmarketable; and with respect to tithes, and some other interests, the most serious prejudice may be sustained by the person in possession. The Register Office would put a stop to all inconvenience arising from the loss of deeds for the future. A more serious mischief, and one which gentlemen unacquainted with the details of conveyancing can hardly be made adequately to feel, arises from covenants for the production of title-deeds, and the obligation to give attested copies of them. As property is subdivided and sold in lots, these covenants become every day more common. But infinite difficulty arises in enforcing the performance of them, and on the sale of small properties the expense of giving attested copies to the purchaser sometimes is nearly equal to the value of the fee simple. A well authenticated case lately occurred, where a gentleman sold an estate to an attorney, and was bound to furnish him with attested copies of the title-deeds. It was found that the expense of these attested copies would be enormous: but the attorney insisted upon having them, and threatened to file a bill in Chancery for that purpose. However, he relented to a certain degree, and said to the vendor, "I will not be too hard upon you. Let me have the estate without paying the purchase-money, and I will waive my claim to the attested copies of the title-deeds." The proposal was joyfully accepted. I need hardly mention, that after the establishment of a Register, all that would be necessary on such occasions would be a reference to the books or compartment in the office in which the deeds would be found. For the same reason, deeds may in future be most materially shortened. It is well known that they are swelled out to their present unwieldy size chiefly by the recitals of other deeds: such recitals would become unnecessary, and would be discontinued. By this and certain other improvements in conveyancing, which will arise from obviating the necessity for livery of seisin or entry to perfect an estate, and allowing the creating of all estates directly by deed which can now be created by will or through the medium of the Statute of Uses, I hope to see deeds shrink into their ancient dimensions,—when a grant or conveyance seldom occupied more than a piece of parchment ten inches square, instead of consuming, as at present, the skins of a moderately sized flock of sheep. The shortening of deeds will thus be a consequence of the Register, and will be again found greatly to facilitate its operations; so that, although it may have obstructions to encounter in its outset, when it is once in full play it will proceed with celerity and smoothness. Sir, I am now brought to consider the objections to an institution which *prima facie* offers such advantages. It shall be my endeavour to overlook none of them, and by no means to understate them. I allow that they deserve the most serious consideration of the House; but when deliberately and dispassionately examined, I believe they will be found to arise partly from false reasoning, but chiefly from a misconception of facts. The first grand objection is, that a General Register would be a great innovation; and we are told to respect the wisdom of our early ancestors, to whom such an institution was unknown. Sir, not one in ten thousand of those ancestors could read or write, for which reason land was transferred, without writing, by corporal delivery; but they did their best to give notoriety to the transaction, and to guard against fraud, by requiring the delivery to be made on a public occasion before the Peers. And this precaution probably was sufficient; for, at that remote æra, the diversified interests in the same land, which are now familiar to us were unknown, and the person in possession was generally owner of the fee. But the necessity for registration, as a guard against secret conveyances and charges, was felt in the reign of Henry 8th, as soon as the Statute of Uses allowed livery of seisin and entry to be dispensed with; and there can be no doubt that the Statute of Inrolments was intended as a general register, although the measure was very clumsily contrived, and was soon entirely evaded, as it was held not to apply to a chattel interest in land. Hence, in due time, sprung up the celebrated assurance of lease and release, by which all the property in the kingdom is now conveyed, having secrecy for its object, and gaining that object so effectually that if the grantor himself prepares the deeds, the fact that he has executed them, and denuded himself of his interest, may rest entirely in his own breast. There is nothing like this in any other country in the world. Over the rest of Europe, independently of a Register, an interest in real property can only be transferred by an instrument executed by the parties before a notary public, and left in his care for the inspection of all persons interested in it. The Legislature of this country has at various times since the reign of Henry 8th shown its sense of the necessity of guarding against secret conveyances and charges, although hitherto no general measure has been adopted for that purpose. Judgments must be docketed or registered for public inspection before they bind the land. Unless annuities are inrolled or registered within a certain time, they are absolutely void. So an entry at the custom-house, or registration, of every instrument conveying an interest in British shipping, is a condition precedent to the operation of the transfer even against the grantor—a much more rigid enactment than any we propose respecting real property. Registers for real property have been long established in England for Middlesex and Yorkshire, containing one-fifth of the population, and probably more than one-fifth of the wealth of that part of the United Kingdom, and, defective as they are in their arrangements, they bave been found beneficial, and no proposal has ever been made to abolish them. Sir, it is a curious and important fact, that no country in any part of the world has ever established a public register of deeds affecting real property, and afterwards laid it aside. The experiment has been repeated often enought to justify the conclusion I draw from it, on the most cautious principles of induction. There has been a General Register for the whole of Ireland upwards of a century. Some sinecures have been fastened upon it, and the indexes have been imperfectly kept; but notwithstanding these abuses and defects, I believe there is no Irish Member who will not bear testimony to its general utility; and amidst the extravagant and factious cry for a repeal of the Union, no one in that country has been so extravagant or factious as to cry for a repeal of the Register. In Scotland there has been a General Register-office since the year 1617. It is the glory of the law of that country, and the boast of every Scotchman. I can say of my own knowledge, that it gives a feeling of security to purchasers and creditors, which in the unregistered counties of England is wholly unknown. Holland had the honour of setting the example to Europe of a public Register as well as of civil and religious liberty; and since the time of the Emperor Charles 5th, she has had this institution, to which some have ascribed a great portion of her prosperity. The institution has been adopted with various modifications, in France, in Switzerland, in the greatest part of Germany, in Sweden, in Norway, in Denmark, and in most of the States of Italy. It has travelled across the Atlantic, and it now flourishes, I believe, in all the States of the North American Union, and all his Majesty's Colonies in the West-Indies and America. And we are told, that the establishment of a General Register in England would be a dangerous innovation. The next objection is one which I find greatly relied upon in certain meetings which have lately been held in the North, by anticipation, to petition against the Register Bill,—I mean, Expense. Now, Sir, I take it upon myself to declare, upon calculations that cannot deceive, that it will occasion no expense at all to the public, and that the expense to the parties will be extremely moderate, being overbalanced tenfold by the expenses which they will then avoid. Sir, I propose no sumptuous buildings, at least until they can be afforded out of the fair profits of the establishment. I denounce all sinecures; let efficient service be liberally rewarded, for so the public good requires; but let there be no pay except for efficient service, and let regulations be enacted to ensure the appointment of competent officers, and continued diligence and fidelity in all departments of the institution. Sir, I could show, that from very moderate fees for searches, for registering the deed, and for giving attested copies—that is to say, about 10*s.* for a search, 1*l.* 5*s.* for registering a deed, and one half the charge now made by solicitors for attested copies,—a fund would be raised much more than sufficient to defray all the necessary expense of buildings, officers and other outgoings; so that the Register Office like the Post-office, while it is of the greatest use to individuals, may not only pay its own charges, but fairly contribute to the public revenue. The fees I have mentioned, in large transactions would not be felt;—and in a transaction of any magnitude, who is there that would not willingly give twenty times the amount, to be absolutely sure that his title never could be questioned? In small transactions the fees may be lowered or entirely waived, so that no one may complain. What are these fees, compared to the expenses now incurred by the machinery of terms for years? A popular objection, of which I expect ample use to be made by some who oppose the measure, in truth on other grounds, is Disclosure. I meet this with some apprehension, for it appeals to the imagination, and there is some difficulty in knowing how far the impression which it makes will be removed by facts, however strong. Let me first correct a misconception which has gone abroad, that existing deeds are to be registered. The proposed measure is purely prospective, and all transactions prior to the establishment of the Register will rest unrevealed. Even as to the future, disclosure is not essentially necessary to gain the chief objects of the institution. A Register might be framed which would be open only to persons proving an interest to examine it. But, for my own part, I must acknowledge that disclosure seems to me to be a benefit instead of a drawback. With respect to men not in trade, there seems no reason why they should be allowed to appear to the world as owners of property which they have made away with. A mortgage by a country gentleman, to raise portions for younger children, or to defray the expense of an election, does not hurt his dignity or importance, and at present is well known in the neighbourhood as soon as it is executed. "Danger to commercial credit" has a more alarming sound; but here my case must be allowed to be triumphant. Who ought to be the best judges upon this point?—Surely, the great merchants and bankers of London. Who would suffer from disclosure, if it were dangerous to commercial credit?—The great merchants and bankers of London. Accordingly, the following question was circulated among the twenty-four most eminent merchants' and bankers' houses in London, without the smallest preconcert or regard to any circumstance, except the extent of their dealings, and their reputation in the world. Sir, the list will be found to contain the names of Thomas Wilson and Co.; Fletcher, Alexander, and Co.; Smith, Payne, and Smiths; Jones, Lloyd, and Co.; Grote, Prescott, and Co; Williams, Deacon, and Co.; Robarts, Curtis, and Co.; Thompson, Bonar, and Co; Masterman and Co.; and Barnard, Dimsdale, and Co. The question was, "Do you consider that the disclosure which an open Register would afford of mortgages and encumbrances, would be productive of more evil or good?" Their unanimous answer, in writing, signed by them respectively, is in these words:—"We think, upon general grounds, that any measure which tends to prevent misconception, and to secure accurate information respecting the circumstances and property of commercial men, must, on the whole, produce more good than evil; nor do we see reason to apprehend any serious mischief from the disclosure which an open registry would afford of mortgages and encumbrances, inasmuch as we are confident that more mischief arises in the mercantile world from false appearances of property, and erroneous impressions as to the real circumstances of parties, than from any other cause whatever." But I can appeal to experience to show that this apprehended disclosure is a mere bugbear. In Scotland, the register of sasines may be inspected by all mankind, and no inconvenience has arisen from this publicity. I need not remind the House, that no country in Europe has advanced more rapidly in commerce and wealth than my native land. In Ireland, all encumbrances upon any property may be known, and settlements, to be secure, must be registered; but no inconvenience has been felt. Need I draw the attention of the House to the West Riding of Yorkshire, where there is an open Register, and where manufactures and trade, as well as agriculture, have probably flourished more than in any other part of England. It is a curious fact, that in Middlesex so little account do they make of disclosure, that the memorial, which is only required to state the parties and the premises, usually goes on to state the consideration and the uses, thereby publishing all the secrets of the deed. The disclosure made by memorialising annuities must be very disagreeable to both parties; for I believe no one would like it to be known that he is either grantor or grantee of a life-annuity; yet no one has proposed to repeal the Annuity Act. The registration of shipping has unquestionably been found very salutary in preventing false credit from being obtained. In the port of London it is a common practice for a tradesman, before he supplies stores to a ship, to send to the Custom House to ascertain whether she has been mortgaged. It is a mistake to suppose that people inquire into the affairs of others from mere idle curiosity. There is an open register at Doctors' Commons of all wills proved in the diocese of London, or the province of Canterbury, for centuries, and any one will may be inspected for a shilling. I believe such an inspection is rarely made except on behalf of some one who in justice ought to be permitted to know the contents of the will. Are we told that flaws might be discovered in deeds, if any person might pore over them, or obtain copies of them? For one dispute about a title that arises from a defect in a deed, there are at least one hundred that arise from the defective framing of wills; yet wills have always been open to inspection, and no inconvenience has been felt from this publicity. The only other objection which I have to mention, as it is the only other I am aware of, is the danger of failure to a purchaser or mortgagee from defective search or registration. I allow, Sir, that if fatal mistakes could arise, the lowest degree of ordinary care being exercised, the objection would be insurmountable. But if the exercise of the lowest degree of ordinary care must effectually guard against all mistakes, the objection is removed. Now, that this may be easily accomplished, accords not only with reason, but experience. All that is to be done is to afford the means of ascertaining by search, what deeds and instruments have been registered respecting any particular property, and to provide a form, by observing which, a deed shall have the benefit of being considered registered. These are far less complicated and difficult operations than what are daily going on in the General

---

* The following speech is re-printed by permission, from the corrected copy published by Mr. Campbell.

Post Office, and in the Bank of England. With the defective indexes in Middlesex, Yorkshire, and Ireland, and in Scotland without any index at all, few or no mistakes have arisen, and the English and Irish cases respecting registration, to be found in the books, turn upon the doctrine of notice, and not on any mistake in the mode of search or registration. It may be remarked, that if registration is not made essential to the validity of a deed, and, unregistered, it is valid as against the grantor, the instances must be very rare in which any question can arise touching the mode of registration. The fraud of concealing a deed may be committed by one unconnected individual, though not a professional man. The fraud of executing a second deed, to defeat a deed imperfectly registered, can only be committed by several persons in combination, and with professional assistance. A fatal mistake can only arise from the want of a low degree of ordinary care in the party himself, his agent, or the office. If it arise from his own gross negligence, he has himself alone to blame; if from that of his agent, he must seek his remedy in damages, as in other cases where an agent is guilty of a breach of duty; and if from that of the office, a remedy may be given to him against the office, or against the public, to whom the officer would be answerable with his sureties. Gross personal negligence can alone bring a loss without indemnity, and against a man's own gross personal negligence he has no right to be indemnified. I will now proceed, with the permission of the House, shortly to give an outline of the particular plan of registration which I shall have the honour to propose, and which, after great deliberation and repeated discussions, has been unanimously recommended by the Commissioners. I am very desirous that the House and the public should bear in mind, that various parts of this plan are not essential to registration, and that they may be either omitted or varied, without affecting the principle of the measure. I propose, that there shall be one General Register Office established in the Metropolis, for the whole of England and Wales. Some individuals, and especially country attornies, profess a preference to a Register Office in every county or division of a county. You would thus have about sixty establishments instead of one. I may give a notion of the degree to which the expense of the whole would be increased, by mentioning an accurate calculation which has been made, showing that the expense of the General Metropolitan Office would be very little greater than the expense of the several offices now established in Middlesex, and the different divisions of Yorkshire. But the increased expense would be the least evil. It would be impossible to find officers of competent learning and skill for so many establishments; they would soon vary in their rules and practice, and great confusion would be produced. Premises comprised in one deed, or will, often lie in different counties, and the same instrument might require to be registered several times over in remote parts of England. In one Metropolitan Register Office there must be a great concentration of talent and experience, and there being no waste of power, the work that is to be done will require much less machinery, and much fewer hands. Uniformity of practice must necessarily prevail. The head of the Register Office may be a gentleman of high eminence in the profession. He may have a sort of judicial authority vested in him respecting amendments, subject to an appeal to one of the Courts at Westminster; and regulations for the details of registration may from time to time be made, repealed, or varied by him, with the concurrence of the Lord Chancellor and the Judges. It must be an unspeakable advantage to be able to make all the searches that can be necessary respecting any title, under one roof. A search for judgments must now be made in London, on a country purchase, and not unfrequently a search for probates or administrations—and it will be easy to make searches for deeds at the same time. It is a mistake to suppose that a London agent must be employed for that purpose. Every country solicitor will be allowed to correspond directly with the Register Office through the post, both for directing searches and the registration of deeds. England may now be considered as one great city, and the communication between many remote places and London is easier than with the county-town. Rail-roads are not entirely to be left out of consideration; as there is reason to think that in a few years London may not be more than a few hours distant from any part of the kingdom, the charges may easily be equalized without consideration of distance, so that registration for Cumberland or Cornwall may not be more expensive than for Surrey or Essex. Next comes the mode of Registration. Shall it be by memorial, inrolment, or deposit? The memorial is intended only to give notice that there is a deed between certain parties affecting certain premises; so that its production may be required from the vendor or mortgager. The plan of memorial, though plausible, seems to me objectionable. To prepare the memorial requires some skill, and we have ascertained that the expense of preparing it in Middlesex exceeds what would be the average expense of making a full copy of the deed, which requires only manual labour; and it seems much better that all the contents of the deed should at once be open at the public office to the person making the search. Inrolment, therefore, I prefer to memorial. But the deposit of the original deed, executed by the parties, would in my opinion, be best of all. If any party thinks his deeds are safer in his own strong box, or at his attorney's, than they would be in the Register Office, he has only to execute a duplicate. Now, there being no stamp imposed upon this, it will cost no more than a copy, which I have shown costs less than a memorial. Thus, without any additional expense, and without any risk or privation to the parties, an original of every deed may be deposited at the office. The building may easily be made fire-proof, and I hope, in spite of Swing and his adherents, that it may be effectually guarded against the fury of a mob: but if, by some accident or public convulsion, the Register Office should be destroyed, the duplicates in the possession of the parties would remain, and titles would be at least in as good a situation as before registration was established. It would lead me into too tiresome a detail if I were to point out the many collateral advantages which would arise from the deposit of the original deeds at the Register Office—of which, preventing the forging and falsification of deeds would not be the least. I should have observed, that the attorney always charges a fair copy to keep, although such copy is seldom made; and this item alone, in a conveyancing bill, for which hereafter there could be no pretext, would more than cover the expense of what I suggest. If deeds are shortened, as I sanguinely hope soon to see them, the expense of a duplicate would be too trifling to be regarded by the most miserly. The next consideration is, What instruments shall be registered? On this point, different States have acted differently. In some the registration is confined to transactions *inter vivos;* and in others, hypothecations or mortgages only are registered, and not absolute sales. But a register cannot be perfect unless it embraces all written instruments which in any way affect the title to real property. I therefore think, that the Bill should extend to every deed or writing which creates any estate at law or in equity, or passes any interest in land, or gives any lien upon it. Thus, executory contracts ought to be registered, as well as deeds, wills, commissions of bankrupt, &c.; but, to obviate this inconvenience, permission may be given, that the vendor may grant a caveat, whereby no deed or instrument touching the premises can be registered within a certain time, unless in favour of the purchaser. This will be put upon the register, and will effectually protect the purchaser and others, while it is in force. The same expedient may be resorted to for the purpose of protecting a purchaser in the interval between the search and the time when the purchase deed is registered. This will completely obviate the danger of a subsequent deed from the vendor, in favour of another person, being fraudulently registered first, and will avoid the necessity of fixing any time during which a deed shall absolutely prevail before it is registered. Upon registration of the deed the caveat has performed its functions, and a certificate of the act will be the warrant for payment of the purchase-money. I ought to mention, that it is not intended that surrenders, or any instruments respecting copyhold estates, which now appear upon the Court rolls, should be included in the General Register. But if a lien for purchase money is to be claimed, it must be put upon the register; and, above all, Crown debts and obligations must be registered, or they shall not bind the land. A grievance of the most serious description is now experienced from the land of any person indebted, or under obligation to the Crown, being bound, although there are no means of knowing who is so indebted, or who is under such obligation. How the grievance or abuse (for so I must call it) should have been so long endured, is to me, I own, inexplicable. If there be any suspicion that a man who wishes to sell or charge his estate is a Crown debtor, there are various Government offices at which some imperfect information may be irregularly obtained. But it not unfrequently happens that a man has given bond to the Crown as surety, or has in some way received Government money into his hands, without the fact being suspected by any one; and at present no man can certainly tell that the person from whom he purchases an estate may not be in this situation. It follows, that the day after the purchaser has taken possession, or fifty years after he and his family have been in undisputed enjoyment, an extent may come in without the slightest previous notice; the superior title of the Crown admits of no question, and the estate is sold to pay the Crown debt. It is absurd to suppose, that a registration of Crown debts would be any infringement on the prerogative of the Crown. Let the Crown, for the public good, have all its remedies against its debtors; but let not those remedies, without doing any good to the public, work the ruin of innocent individuals, who are not even chargeable with the least particle of incaution. I can see no difficulty in a list being kept of persons indebted or under obligation to the Crown. The parties are more likely to object than the Crown, but they can have no laudable motive for concealment, and justice imperiously requires that their situation should be known. The most material consideration in the plan of a new Register is the framing of the Index. Indeed, the difficulty of showing with ease and accuracy all registered documents concerning any particular property is, in my humble judgment, the only serious objection to a Register; and the true question is, whether this difficulty can be surmounted. How they have hitherto contrived to get on in Scotland without an Index, I confess I do not comprehend. Considerable inconvenience has been felt, and an Index is now in preparation under the superintendance of a gentleman of great learning and ingenuity, who has long presided over the establishment at Edinburgh. In the English and Irish Registers, the Indexes are alphabetical; but the labour and expense of searching them are often very burthensome, from there being many persons of the same name, and the same person sometimes conveying a great many separate tenements,—as a speculator in houses, who buys ground and builds new streets. Where there is a purchase to be made from a man of a given name, all deeds or memorials appearing in the Index with a man of this name as the grantor, must be inspected. I have been told of a search in the Middlesex Register which lasted three months, and cost above 100*l.* A plan has been under consideration, of having a general survey of the kingdom, with maps on a large scale, showing the minutest subdivision of property, with numbers to be referred to in the Deed and affixed to the Index; but beside the objection of expense, the boundaries of property are often so indistinct, and shift so often, that it was thought the parcels supposed to be designated by numbers could not be certainly known. This plan has been beneficially followed in the Bedford Level, an agricultural district, where the boundaries are distinct, and are seldom changed; but, in my opinion, it is wholly inapplicable to a great kingdom. The Index which this Bill proposes, proceeds upon a classification of deeds; the first registered deed respecting any property being considered the root of the title. This will be registered under a particular symbol, and all subsequent deeds respecting the same interests will be registered under the same symbol. By referring to the symbol in the Index, all the deeds respecting the property may at once be found. Provision will be made for adding to or taking from the property contained in the first deed, and the Index being kept somewhat on the principles of book-keeping, no search will, in general, be required beyond a certified copy of the entries under the symbol. The essentials of registration will be an entry of the deed in the Index, under the proper symbol, with the date of the deed, the date of registration, and the book or compartment in the office where the deed may be found. Various regulations will be introduced respecting wills, legacies, commissions of bankrupt, &c. With these details I will not fatigue the House. Where such a vast variety of objects must be provided for, it is in vain, and it would be unreasonable, to expect that the enactments of the Bill can be few, or that they should appear simple to persons unacquainted with the subject. There is no royal road to astronomy; and abstruse legal discussions can only be intelligible to lawyers. The specification of a patent is reckoned sufficient if the machine can be made from it by an engineer, although it should be above the comprehension of all the Members of both Houses of Parliament. I therefore hope that this Bill will not be condemned by any lay Lord, Knight, or Burgess, merely because it may contain some clauses which he does not fully comprehend. I can assure the House that the utmost pains have been taken to make it as short and as simple as possible. There is one point which I must bring under the notice of the House, the importance of which will at once be seen by the hon. member for Boroughbridge, and upon which, in my judgment, the success of the measure, in a great degree, depends; that is, whether the preference of a registered to an unregistered deed shall be taken away by evidence that the party claiming under the registered deed had notice of the unregistered deed. The Commissioners, who agreed unanimously in favour of a Register, were nearly equally divided upon this point; but I am bound to say, that I have a very strong opinion, with the majority, against giving effect to notice, either constructive or actual, to defeat a registered title. I purpose to bring in the Bill with a clause to this effect. The reasons for the contrary opinion will deserve to be weighed with all respect; but I think the party who has neglected to register his deed, has no cause to complain if he loses his estate. "*Vigilantibus non dormientibus subveniunt leges.*" It is of the greatest advantage to have a broad rule, not subject to exceptions, which fritter it away, and involve parties in constant litigation. To defeat a registered deed by mere constructive notice, shocks every one; and the boundary between actual and constructive notice is often only imaginary. If the registered title does not rigidly prevail, you subject every man who purchases an estate, to the loss of it by fabricated parol evidence, or the caprice of a Judge. Lord Hardwicke, and the greatest Equity Judges, have lamented that any effect has been given to notice under the present local Register Acts; and it seems to me that their beneficial effects have been thereby materially impaired. The example of other countries leads to the same result. The Chancellor D'Aguesseau, having consulted all the Parliaments of France upon a question the same in principle, they all, with one exception, agreed that notice was to be disregarded. In Scotland the rule is rigid, that the registered deed shall prevail, notwithstanding notice of a prior unregistered deed; and no inconvenience has ever arisen from it. The Code Napoleon lays down the same rule. In England, even notice of a contract void by the Statute of Frauds operates nothing; the title of a purchaser cannot be impeached by showing that he had notice of a voluntary settlement; and it has been expressly determined, that under the Ship Register Acts notice of an unregistered bill of sale is quite immaterial. The vital principle of a General Register is, that title shall entirely depend upon the written documents entered upon the Register. How is this consistent with letting in the doctrine of notice? Fraud will still be open to the cognizance of a Court of Equity; and a contrivance between two or more to prevent or delay the registration of a deed, that a deed subsequently executed may have priority, would be the subject of an indictment at Common Law for a conspiracy. A remedy may likewise be given by action, without affecting the registered title. Sir, I have been asked whether any provision is to be made in this Bill for preserving evidence of pedigree. The law upon this subject is most defective. It is easier in any old family to prove a descent five hundred years ago, than in the beginning of the last century; and there has been since little improvement in this respect. There is no public evidence of pedigree, except from parish registers, which have been kept with the most shameful negligence, and which do not comprehend those who dissent from the Church of England,—a very large proportion of his Majesty's subjects. The parish register, in recording baptisms, does not profess to give the time of birth, which is often so important, and it contains nothing to identify families beside similarity of name. Sir, there ought certainly to be in this country, as there is in France, and almost every where on the Continent of Europe, a civil register of births, marriages and deaths, comprehending persons of all religions, and of no religion, if unhappily there are any such—with a description of the parties by residence, profession, or parentage, to leave no doubt as to their identity. This measure, however, is essentially different from a register of deeds, and must be reserved for future consideration. It will be greatly facilitated by the establishment of a General Register

Office. Copies of the district registers of births, marriages and deaths, would be transmitted to the General Register Office, —and in one place all searches of all sorts respecting title and pedigree would take place for the whole kingdom. Sir, when this Bill has been brought in, it must be judged of by its merits, and the House will act upon their own opinion in adopting or rejecting it; but in moving for leave to bring it in, that it may be submitted to discussion, I think I may fairly mention some of the great names by whose authority the measure is recommended. Lord Hale, and the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the state of the Law in the time of the Commonwealth, and who suggested some of the noblest improvements which the law has undergone, prepared a Bill for the establishment of a General Register. They proposed to erect an Office in every County, the only mode in which the measure was then practicable, when communication with London was so slow and uncertain. After the Restoration, and when filling the highest judicial offices, Lord Hale continued to recommend the measure with unabated zeal. When local registers had been partially established, and were found beneficial, Mr. Justice Blackstone, and other sages of the law, regretted that they were not universally established. Upon several occasions it has been proposed in this House to establish registers in every county; but as the bills introduced for this purpose did not remove the defects in the local registers already established, they did not pass; although the principle of registration appears to have been warmly supported by Sir Samuel Romilly, and the greatest men who then sat in Parliament. Since the second report of theReal Property Commissioners was published, recommending the plan of registration which is the subject of this Bill, I have the satisfaction to say, that it has met with the approbation of the late Lord Chancellor, of the present Lord Chancellor, of the Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench, of the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, of the Lord Chief Baron of the Court of Exchequer, and of a considerable majority of the Judges. There is an illustrious Ex-Chancellor who has declared a decided hostility to the measure. I need not mention that I mean the venerable Earl of Eldon; but I must use the freedom to say, notwithstanding the reverence with which I have been accustomed to regard his judgments, that I think he knows better how the law is than how it ought to be. He has devoted his life so entirely to the task, first of practising and then of interpreting it, that he has left himself but little leisure to consider the improvements of which it is susceptible. He regards all change in our jurisprudence as unnecessary and mischievous; and perhaps he is of opinion that a General Register is a modern invention for abridging labour, which ought to be prohibited along with power-looms and thrashing machines. If any weight is to be given to the publications which have issued from the press, public opinion is strongly in favour of the measure. Many able pamphlets have been published in support of it, and only one, that I am aware of, against it. But there is a formidable body of opponents, against whose influence I feel it my duty to caution the House: I mean the Solicitors. In that branch of the profession there are many men of high honour and liberality, who would be ready to sacrifice their private advantage to the public good. Many of these have communicated valuable information to us, and are ready cordially to co-operate in the establishment of a General Register. But a notion has gone abroad among solicitors, chiefly in the country, that this measure will materially interfere with their professional profits; and I have reason to know that on this ground they are prepared to oppose it, and to get up petitions against it. In these petitions we shall hear nothing of loss of profits to Solicitors, but a great deal of "innovation," "expense," "disclosure," and "danger." Many Members of this House, and particularly country gentlemen, are so much under the influence of their Solicitors, that I cannot look upon their opposition without some dismay. But I must entreat hon. Members to judge for themselves; I would ask such as have been concerned in sales or mortgages, to refresh their memories by reading the bills of these Solicitors. No blame is to be imputed for making such charges, which arise, not from the fault of individuals, but from the defective state of the law itself. But the burthen thrown upon the landed interest by the enormous expense of the present mode of conveyancing, is a grievous tax upon them, which they ought to submit to no longer. The whole expense, whether nominally paid by the vendor or purchaser, obviously by so much lessens the value of the subject sold. In mortgages, if the law-charges are added to the interest or subtracted from the sum borrowed, the harassed mortgager will often find, that instead of four or five, he pays six or seven per cent for the loan. The expense of transferring funded property is one-eighth per cent, and the whole proceeding is completed in a few minutes. It would be vain to expect that real property can ever be transferred with the same despatch and economy; but I entertain the firmest conviction, that the delay and expense now experienced might be most materially diminished, and that the first step to be taken for this purpose is the establishment of a General Register. Another mode may be adopted of remunerating the Solicitors, who ought always to be treated as belonging to a liberal profession; but it is desirable that the recompense they receive should depend upon the confidence reposed in them, and the skill and assiduity they display in any particular transaction: not upon the length of the deeds, which, without personal trouble or responsibility, they procure to be drawn by a conveyancer and engrossed by a stationer. I have now, Sir, sufficiently explained the nature of the plan which I have proposed, to enable the House to decide whether leave should be given to bring in the Bill. I will venture to make one remark with some confidence,—that the measure must either be at once adopted for the whole of England and Wales, or entirely rejected. It has been suggested, I will not say insidiously, that a partial trial should first be made of the new system of Registration, either in one of the register counties, or in a single maiden county, where no register has yet been established. Sir, this would not be a fair trial, and it ought not to be attempted: it would be effectually thwarted by the enemies of the measure. The object is, to change the existing system of conveyancing, and the habits of professional men. This cannot be effected unless the new system be universally introduced. Therefore, Sir, thanking the House, for its indulgence, and not further trespassing on its patience by any recapitulation of the topics which I have touched upon, I will conclude by moving for leave to bring in a "Bill for establishing a General Register for all deeds and instruments affecting Real Property in England and Wales."

Sir *E. B. Sugden* disclaimed any intention of offering a captious opposition to the proposition of his hon. and learned friend; although he would take a future oportunity of stating in what he differed in opinion from him. He now, however, wished to ask his hon. and learned friend, whether he brought the measure in on his own responsibility, or whether it had been previously submitted to his Majesty's Government?

Mr. *Campbell* replied, that he had brought in the Bill with the concurrence of the present Lord Chancellor; but not as a measure to which Government was at present pledged. Government was not at present determined whether to support or to oppose the measure. The measure was, in the first instance, brought forward by him as a Member of the House of Commons; but with the full concurrence and approbation of the Lord Chancellor.

Sir *E. B. Sugden* observed, that the commission which had been appointed to inquire into the laws affecting real property was authorised to investigate, but not to originate any measure themselves. It was the bounden duty of Government to consider whether the measures recommended by the commission ought to be adopted: and if they thought so, to originate them on the responsibility of the Law-officers of the Crown.

Sir *C. Wetherell* hoped, that when the Bill came to be discussed, the House would have the benefit of the presence of every county Member who might prefer having the title-deeds of his estate in his own house, rather than in the recondite mausoleum of parchments which his hon. and learned friend proposed to erect. He trusted that every county Member especially, and that the House at large, would hesitate before they adopted what, he could not but think, was a proposition pregnant with the greatest mischiefs. He would not have risen on the present occasion, however, but for his hon. and learned friend's ambidextrous allusion to Lord Eldon. His hon. and learned friend certainly patted that noble and learned Lord with the one hand, but then he knocked him down with the other. The vocabulary of praise was exhausted on that noble and venerable person in the first instance, but then it was added, that he was so learned in the law as it stood, that his mind was not strong enough, or liberal enough, to consider of what amendment it was susceptible. The noble and learned Lord was certainly not a hasty reformer of the law, because he knew what the law was; but there was a class of persons in the country who wished hastily to change the law, because they did not know what the law was. Those persons had not had quite so much experience of the law as the noble and learned Lord. He (Sir C. Wetherell) had a great respect for all the members of the various law-commissions; but with all that respect, he must take the liberty of saying, that he could not put their knowledge and experience of the law into competition with the knowledge and experience of the noble and learned Lord. With respect to the proposed measure, the present was not the proper time for discussing it. Otherwise, he should be disposed to ask, who was to build the immense fabric, the construction of which was contemplated by his hon. and learned friend? It would be necessary to have recourse to the assistance of the Board of Works in building so enormous an establishment. He thought that the plan of a general registry never could be realised. On these grounds, therefore, he should hesitate before he gave his concurrence to the plan proposed by his hon. and learned friend. He gave his hon. and learned friend the fullest credit for the ingenious and pleasant speech he had made in introducing the measure—a speech in which he had attained an object not often attained by lawyers—that of making a legal subject intelligible to all, and a dry subject the means of much pleasantry, though his pleasantry, by-the-bye, consisted chiefly of some goodly fictions. With these facetiæ, however, he had inclined the House to lend a favourable ear to his measure, though it certainly had not met with the approbation of some of the highest names in the profession; and for his part he might say with Lord Eldon, that though evils did certainly exist at present in the mode of transferring and assuring the titles of real property, the evils which the proposed system might introduce, would probably be at least equivalent to those from which the owners of land were at present suffering. He could not, therefore, give his concurrence to the measure.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* might perhaps feel, with the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, that it was a little extraordinary that a measure, introduced by a Gentleman who was a commissioner to inquire into the laws regulating real property, and who was at the same time a Member of that House, should not have received the concurrence of his Majesty's Government; but still, whether it had that advantage or not, it should most unquestionably have his best support. There was, however, no wonder that the plan should have wanted the approbation of Lord Eldon, for it was a plan of reform, and that noble Lord was no reformer, as was clearly proved by the fact, that he had presided for twenty-five years in the Court of Chancery, and yet, though the abuses of that Court had been so manifest that no man now ventured to defend them, that noble Lord had not once in the whole course of his judicial career, proposed a single reform, but seemed to have found the whole of the law of that Court to be the perfection of human reason. The measure now proposed fully deserved the support of every man in that House.

Mr. *Hume* said, that whether the hon. and learned Member who introduced this measure did it as a commissioner, with the authority of the Government, or as an individual Member of that House, he was equally entitled to credit for his exertions, and for the learning and ability he had so usefully directed to this subject. The measure was one of very necessary reform, and he would give it his cordial support. Having heard much praise of the Register system of Scotland, he wished to see that system introduced here. He trusted, therefore, that the House would not be led away by the opposition of the hon. and learned member for Boroughbridge, nor by his fearful pictures of a metropolitan mausoleum of deeds. In spite of what had been said on a former occasion, he (Mr. Hume) wished to have law so intelligible that everybody could understand it—he amongst the rest. The lawyers might wish it otherwise, but the statement of theirs, that law was and must remain a science, amounted to this—that the people could not and should not do without them. Now he wished to do without them altogether, and therefore he should support the measure of a General Register.

Sir *James Scarlett* observed, that this was not a fit moment for the discussion of the merits of such a measure as that of a General Register: he should, therefore, abstain from entering into the details of the question, but would give his opinion decidedly in favour of the measure, as far as he had been able to consider it at present. He should reserve his opinion on the details till the proper time came for the discussion; and all he should now state was, his opinion that, when it had been fully discussed, it would be found worthy of the ability and learning of the gentlemen who had devoted their time and talents to its formation.

The *Attorney General* said, that the expressions employed by an hon. Member with respect to Lord Eldon were probably not intended to apply to that noble Lord alone, but to the other members of the profession, for lawyers were not generally considered a reforming tribe. But that very circumstance gave additional value to this measure, proposed as it was by a lawyer of great eminence, and having the support of many of the most learned members of the profession. He should be surprised if, on the fullest discussion of the subject, the opinions of the best educated men, lawyers or not lawyers, were not found to be in its favour. It was no objection to the measure that it had not obtained the declared support of the Government, for it did not require authority, founded as it was upon sound good sense, and upon the necessity of the case. The measure, however, if authority were wanted, had the authority of the hon. and learned Gentleman who introduced it, himself a very learned lawyer, of the former and present Lord Chancellor, and certainly of a majority of the present Government. That fact ought to relieve the lawyers from the imputations that had been cast upon them. Suppose the necessary calls on the attention of the Government at the present moment had prevented them from considering it so that they could not give it their declared support, still the House were obliged to the hon. and learned Member for bringing it forward, and he was certain the Government would do nothing to stifle the measure, even if they did not support it; but he hoped it would be found they could give it their full and cordial support.

Mr. *Freshfield* defended the branch of the profession to which he had the honour to belong, from the imputation about their fear of their occupation being gone. He was sure that the Attorneys and Solicitors were as ready as others to sacrifice their personal interests when the public welfare required them to do so; and hon. Members had no right to suspect them of opposition to this or any other measure of reform till they had declared themselves opposed to it.

Mr. *John Campbell*:—As I do not find that there is any opposition to bringing in the Bill, although some hostility is threatened to it in its future stages, I shall have to trouble the House very briefly in reply. I should regret exceedingly if it were thought that I had reflected upon the Solicitors as a body; but I considered it my duty to throw out a caution to some of them, to consider whether, in the steps they are taking to excite a prejudice against the establishment of a General Register, they are not actuated by an exaggerated apprehension, that it will materially interfere with their own gains. And I thought I might, without offence, offer a suggestion (which I am sure, if it could be carried into effect, would be most agreeable to my hon. friend, the member for Penrhyn, who is so eminent in this department of the profession), that another mode should be adopted for remunerating the valuable services of Solicitors employed in conveyancing, whereby they may no longer appear to have an interest against their duty. Considering the unbounded confidence reposed in them on the most important occasions of life, there can be no doubt that it is for the public advantage that their remuneration, by whatever rule it may be determined, should be ample. The only argument as yet brought forward against the measure itself, is the apprehended expense of erecting the building in which the deeds are to be deposited; and I am happy to be able to tranquillize the fears of the hon. member for Boroughbridge upon this subject. We do not mean that the Register Office in London should be one of the wonders of the world, like the tomb raised by Queen Artemesia to her husband Mausolus,—to which my hon. and learned friend has been pleased to compare it,—but should be composed of plain brick, mortar, and iron; and I can tell him, that of these materials a commodious, substantial, fire-proof building, sufficient to contain all the deeds to be executed in England for 100 years to come, may, by estimate, be constructed for the sum of

20,000*l*. Sir, I feel as much as my hon. and learned friend, the member for Weymouth, the importance of this measure being supported by Government; and I frankly own, that, unless it be cordially supported by Government, I despair of its success. But I differ from him as to the indispensable necessity of Government being pledged to it before it is introduced into this House. Under the peculiar circumstances in which the present Government is placed, obliged suddenly to deliberate and decide upon many important measures of urgent and immediate necessity, great and inconvenient delay must have arisen in bringing forward the Bill for a General Register, if it had been previously discussed in the Cabinet, and formally submitted to the law-officers of the Crown. Till it shall be determined whether the unanimous recommendation of the Real Property Commissioners upon this subject shall be adopted by the Legislature, they are at a loss what course to pursue; for they consider this as the basis of all reform; and upon its adoption or rejection must, in a great degree, depend the ulterior measures for the improvement of the law which they may feel it their duty to suggest. It gave me the most sincere pleasure to hear, that my hon. and learned friend, the Attorney General, as an individual, is favourable to the Bill; and I was much gratified by the liberal and handsome tone in which he spoke of the manner in which it has been brought forward. I do confidently expect, that upon examination it will be found to deserve, and that it will receive, the approbation of his Majesty's Ministers, and of the enlightened individuals of all parties; that it will pass both Houses of Parliament with applause; and that it will be received with satisfaction by the country. For myself, after what has passed, I may be allowed to say, that my only motive in proposing it, is a sincere and ardent desire to improve the institutions of my country. This is my ambition; for this I have made some sacrifices, and I am ready to make more; and I cannot help thinking, that this ambition is nobler, and gives a better chance of lasting fame, than the common-place longing after office and professional advancement. Sir, I have only further to observe, that instead of urging forward the measure with precipitation, I am anxious that the most ample time should be allowed to consider and discuss it. Therefore, if leave be given to bring in the Bill, I propose, that after being read a first time, it shall be printed; that it shall be circulated as generally as possible, so that not only Members of this House, but all classes of his Majesty's subjects, may have an opportunity of objecting to its principle or its details; and that the second reading, when its fate will probably be decided, shall be fixed for a distant day.

Leave was given Mr. Campbell and Mr. Freshfield to prepare and bring in the Bill.

COURT OF CHANCERY.] Sir *E. B. Sugden*, in rising to call the attention of the House to the Administration of Justice in the Court of Chancery, reminded it that when he was in office he had given notice to bring forward a measure relative to the imperfect Administration of Justice in that Court. As he had now retired from office, he was no longer the person to introduce that measure, which would fall into the hands perhaps of abler men, but certainly not of men more zealous than he in the discharge of so important a duty. Had he continued in office, he should have possessed the power to introduce a measure, which he verily believed would have been of great benefit to the suitors of the Court of Chancery, for he had had the honour to belong to as virtuous a Government as ever presided over the councils of Great Britain—a Government that he was sure would have put down whatever abuses were clearly shewn to exist, without regard to the interests of friends or foes. He felt that he should have received their full support, and on that support he should have relied had he brought in his Bill. Whenever the present Government should bring forward any measure of a similar kind, he should give it his support. He must say, that the subject of the Court of Chancery had never been fairly met, but had always been used for party and political purposes. It was that circumstance which had hitherto prevented it from being made the subject of Reform; for never could an abuse in any office be mentioned, with a view to correct it, but a proposition was instantly made to do away with the office altogether. That House had thus, in many instances, thrown difficulties in the way of the late Government which would not exist with respect to the present.

In what he was about to state he wished it to be understood, that he did not pledge the late Ministers; but he would now mention, that he had been desired to undertake the introduction of certain plans of Reform. He did undertake them; but before they could be matured and presented to the Ministers for the expression of their opinion upon them, they had gone out of office. His opinions had been mistaken the other night, and he now wished to correct the mistake. He would say what seemed to him a proper course to adopt. He would cut down all patent places now held in reversion—all incomes obtained from fees paid by the suitors of the Court, especially when paid to persons who took no part in the Administration of Justice. There was one place of that description with 10,000*l.* a-year. Could anything be more monstrous then that an office of 10,000*l.* per annum should be held by a person in reversion, which sum was obtained by means of fees that came out of the pockets of the suitors?—Was this system to go on?—Now, he ventured to suggest, that from that large sum 2,000*l.* a-year should be paid in part of the Lord Chancellor's salary—of which salary he now gave no opinion—and the 8,000*l.* should be struck off altogether.—Cheap and expeditious justice he was anxious to see administered, and that alteration would be a great relief to the suitors. Another evil at present existing was the state of the Court of Chancery itself. If the Vice-Chancellor's Court and the Rolls' Court had been properly settled at the time the first of them was created—and if at the same time the offices connected with them had been properly regulated, with a view to clear off the business—the complaints now made would never have been heard. Such a course would have been much more advantageous than it would be to separate the business of bankruptcy from the Lord Chancellor's jurisdiction. In his opinion, nothing could be more mischievous than such a separation, and he hoped never to see the day when that would be done. That the general administration of bankruptcy was bad he was ready to admit; but he did not think it ought to be made a separate jurisdiction. It had been said by some persons, when it was proposed to institute the Vice-Chancellor's Court, that that Judge would do no business. That supposition had proved to be utterly unfounded. The Vice-Chancellor's Court had become, to all intents and purposes, the Court of Chancery, and the Court of Chancery had become a Court of Appeals, and little else. Nobody intended to produce that effect at the time; but the effect had been produced, and it was beneficial, in some respects as it regarded the Administration of Justice, but injurious and detrimental in other respects, as it impeded the course of business in the offices, and created as much delay in one way as it got rid of in another. The persons who produced the measure for instituting the Vice-Chancellor's Court never imagined that that Judge would do so much business that four Registrars could not keep up with him; but if they had foreseen that fact, they ought not to have appointed him, without appointing at the same time those officers who would have removed the impediments that stood in the way of the discharge of the business of the Court. As the Vice-Chancellor's Court and the Court of the Master of the Rolls now stood, in relation to the performance of the business of the Court of Chancery, they clashed with each other; for if two parties were about to make cross-motions in the same cause, though both these motions ought to come on together, one party could take his motion to the Vice-Chancery Court, and the other could take his to the Court of the Master of the Rolls. In consequence, too, of the present state of these two Courts, the Vice-Chancellor's Court, and the Court of the Master of the Rolls, each had a Bar of its own; but the Lord Chancellor's Court never could have a separate Bar, but must draw its Bar from one or other of the two other Courts. The Lord Chancellor could not hold his sittings there regularly, on account of his political functions, and of the appeals he had to hear in the House of Lords. His proposition would avoid that difficulty. He would make the Rolls' Court a Court for the transaction of all business except that of bankruptcy, as the Vice-Chancellor's was now; for as they were at present constituted, one set of Counsel might be heard in one of the Courts, in discussing a motion that really decided the merits of the cause, and yet when the cause itself came on again in the Court of Chancery, different Counsel were also of necessity employed. He should propose, that in future no draftsman should draw a bill, without fixing on it a mark to show in which of the Courts that Bill should come on. It had been the intention of the late Government to make a most important alteration in the Vice-Chancellor's Court; for he had had the authority of Lord Lyndhurst for proposing a measure that would have made the Vice-Chancellor an independent Judge, instead of being, as he was now, at the beck and call of the Chancellor. Having said thus much with respect to the Court of Chancery, he now came to the alterations he proposed to make in the Court of Exchequer. In consequence of the appointment of an additional Judge in the Court of Exchequer, he would propose that he, or one of them, should be the First Baron of the Court, and that the Chief Baron should confine himself wholly to Equity; and that in cases where he felt a pressure, he should call in the assistance of the First or most competent Baron; and, that, on the other hand, the First Judge on the Law side should, on questions of difficulty, more particularly connected with Equity, call in the assistance of the Equity Judge. This would render the Exchequer a most effective Court for the decision of cases, both of Law and Equity. There would, by this means also, be established an efficient Court of Appeal in all Equity cases—a Court of which the want was very greatly felt. The entire removal of the Court of Exchequer had been contemplated by some, but he would take that opportunity of stating, that such an intention had never been for an instant entertained by him. He saw no reason why that Court should be abolished; its antiquity was as great as that of the King's Bench or Common Pleas; and, with the alterations he had suggested, he thought it could be rendered fully as useful as either of those Courts. Before he came to the subject of the appellate jurisdiction, he would make one other observation on the subject of the proceedings in Chancery; and that was, that the whole of the Orders of that Court should be revised and remodelled. The new orders had not by any means been attended with the good effects that had been anticipated from them, and nothing would answer the purpose except a revision and remodelling the whole of them, both new and old. And they ought all to be made so clear and simple, that even a member for Middlesex might understand them. And as to the orders and system of proceedings in the Exchequer, he would propose that they should be the same as in Chancery, that the country might be saved from the inconvenience and disgrace of having two systems of Equity procedure. He had said, that no set of men were more disinterested than the Equity lawyers when the question came to be what was best for the public: he was about to give the House an example of that disinterestedness. There were such things in the Court of Chancery as motions of course, which were really of no use. These were wholly in the hands of the junior Counsel, and the fee on each was half a guinea. These he had proposed to have abolished, but feeling some delicacy in proposing an improvement which would cost himself nothing, without communicating with those who were to be affected by it, he mentioned the matter to the junior Chancery barristers, and they, one and all, concurred in the propriety of the abolition of these motions. Some of these fees came into the hands of the Master of the Rolls, but they served no necessary purpose in the progress of a suit, and, therefore, ought to be abolished. There was one remark on the subject of the despatch of business in the Courts, which he felt himself called upon to make. It was very common in that House to praise a Judge for despatching a great deal of business in a short time, and the natural consequence would be, that Judges would be anxious to deserve that praise without, perhaps, duly considering other essential requisites in the progress of a cause. Celerity was only one thing to be considered. It was of the last importance that the thing should be well done, as well as speedily done; and no despatch could be proper that interfered with due deliberation. It was of the last consequence that causes should be managed in such a way as to satisfy the suitors that their interests had been sufficiently attended to, and they never would be satisfied unless their causes were considered with deliberation, and not hurried on in such a way as to give occasion to a suspicion that they had not been properly considered. These praises for despatch ought, therefore, to be used sparingly, otherwise they might do a great deal of mischief. He could not help admiring a rule of Cromwell made two centuries ago, which was, that when, after a cause had been heard, and the Judge was ready to proceed to a decree, the decree should be drawn up and read in open Court, in the presence of the Counsel on both sides, before any other business was gone into. This was a most wise and judicious regulation, and he wished it had always been adhered to. But as the matter was managed at present, there was no time to set down and settle what had been done in one cause before another was called on, so that it could not immediately be exactly known what had been decided. The consequence was, that perhaps in three weeks after, it was necessary to have a second hearing at the Registrar's Office, in order to settle what had been decreed. That was not a mode in which the business ought to be conducted. Time ought to be taken after hearing a cause to settle the decree at once; and if that could not be done according to the present system, then it was his opinion that a new Court should be appointed for the purpose. Without care in this respect, there was danger that they would forget the case, and have the whole of their work to do over again. Another most material point, in his opinion, was, that, as Lord Bacon had said, the Judge should take the law out of his library, and not out of his head, as otherwise there might be reason to apprehend that the law would escape him, and Counsel would be at a loss what opinion to give; and very little dependence could be placed on the opinion, when given, with reference to the ultimate determination of the cause. There was another thing which he was most anxious to see established in the Equity Courts, and that was Special Paper Days, when they might argue the law upon a settled state of facts, and not be always disputing, as at present, on cases of mixed law and fact, each stating the facts of the case in his own way, and applying the law to his own state of facts. The practice of the Court of King's Bench afforded an admirable example in this way. In that Court, difficult and important causes were turned into what were called Special Cases, in which the facts were settled and agreed upon by the Counsel for the parties, with the assistance of the Judge, if necessary; and then the cases came on to be argued on the special paper days upon the law only, upon a settled and indisputable state of facts; whereas, according to their practice in Equity, every man made his own statement of facts, and applied the law to that particular state and view of the facts. They had also causes which were called short causes, in which it was understood that important and difficult points ought not to be introduced. Nevertheless, it was not uncommon at present to introduce delicate and important questions of law into such cases, so that they were decided without that deliberation which their importance demanded. Another proposition which he would, therefore, have made, was, that such points should be carefully excluded from short causes. He now proceeded to state a greater evil than any that he had mentioned, and one which imperiously called for a remedy; and that was, the preliminary references to the Masters in some cases. For instance, a man died intestate; and then, when a person claiming to be his representative, instituted a suit, it was referred to the Master to consider, and report whether the person claiming to be the representative was really entitled to that character. Now, he would maintain, that the very contrary practice would be the safer rule to proceed on, which was, that when the persons who claimed the effects of an intestate came before the Court, the Court ought to decide at once upon their rights, and afterwards, if any necessity existed, to refer their several claims to the Master to report upon. By this means a vast unnecessary expense would often be avoided, and many references be abolished. As an instance of the necessity of such a proceeding, he would mention a case which came within his own immediate knowledge. When Lord Eldon presided in the Court of Chancery, an intestate's effects were sought to be obtained by a man who claimed as next heir. Instead of referring the claims of this person to the Master, his Lordship proceeded at once to examine into the right upon which the claimant founded his demand, and discovered, after a very short investigation, that the man had not the slightest right to claim the intestate's effects, by which the enormous, and, it would have proved, the useless expense of a reference to the Master was entirely avoided. He lamented that Lord Eldon, for whom he entertained the highest respect, had not introduced some of those improvements into the Court of Chancery while he presided over it. With the great knowledge of the law which that noble Lord possessed, the introduction of such improvements would have raised an eternal monument to his fame. Indeed, shortly before Lord Eldon left the Court of Chancery, he expressed his conviction, seeing the evils which had arisen from this mode of reference in a particular case, that the Court should always decide the right in the first instance, before a reference was made to the Master. Another evil which called loudly for a remedy was the putting off motions from day to day; a practice which introduced a great deal of inconvenience and confusion into the administration of justice. What he should propose was, that all the motions which came on on a Seal Day should be disposed of before the Court proceeded with other business. No more time would be lost by this proposed mode, and the convenience of it would be immense. Another alteration which he should propose was, that the practice of giving preference to causes should be utterly abolished. The causes ought to be heard in their regular order, and in no other way, and this would save a great deal of useless expense, time, and labour. This was the first rule that ought to be adopted when the cause was ready for hearing. A second was, that there should be no delay in the hearing after the cause should be ready; and a third rule, which applied to the Judge particularly, was, that after the hearing there ought to be no more delay in pronouncing the judgment than was absolutely necessary for right decision. This was the most important point of all. The Judge himself, for the most part, had no conception of the extreme anxiety of the suitors to have the judgment given as speedily as possible after the hearing had been finished, and of the constant applications to the Counsel to know when the judgment of the Court would be given. What he should propose was, that an officer of the Court should hang up in some conspicuous part of it a list of all the causes in which judgment was in arrear for six weeks, that the amount of the arrear might be constantly under the eye of the Judge, the Bar, and the suitors. From this simple plan he expected much benefit in the prevention of undue delay in pronouncing judgment after a cause had been heard. There were one or two other points in which he wished amendments to be made; and one was, in the mode of keeping the accounts of certain funds deposited in the Court of Chancery. For instance, a residuary legatee filed a bill, and brought the fund into Court, which accumulated for his benefit at compound interest, while, as to the other parties interested, it lay as a dead fund. This formed a very strong temptation to the residuary legatee to delay the final disposal of the cause, and the distribution of the fund, as long as possible; as, during the whole time the suit was depending, the fund was accumulating for his benefit, without regard to the other parties interested; and it sometimes happened, that by this means residuary legatees, whose interest at the commencement of the suit was scarcely worth a shilling, became entitled at the close of it to thousands of pounds. This was an evil that demanded correction. There was another point on which he was desirous to touch before he came to the matter of appeals, and that was, that the Judge in Equity might be called on to decide on particular points without having the whole of the causes brought before him. The opinion of the Court on one particular point was, in many instances, all that was wanted for the distribution of a fund; and in Scotland the Court had the jurisdiction to decide upon such special points without having any more of the case brought before it; and the power was wisely exercised. But in the Court of Chancery here, before the opinion of the Judge could be had on any one point, it was necessary to file a bill, and bring the whole circumstances of the case before him, whereas his judgment on one point might be all that was requisite for the distribution of the fund. What he should propose, therefore, was, that the Judge might be called upon for the adjudication of the material point, without having the whole of a cause brought before him. And now he came to the consideration of the appellate jurisdiction. It was certainly extremely difficult to find a person for the head of the law who was sufficiently well informed in Law and Equity and other particulars, so as to be able in the best manner to perform all the duties attached to his situation. He did not mean to say that it was a decided objection to the advancement of a man to the head of the law, that he had not practised chiefly in a Court of Equity; but it certainly was a great drawback on the administration of justice. It was unquestionably a great inconvenience that a man's first essay in Equity should be made as Judge of that particular Court where Equity was administered. It might be an evil which they were bound to bear, but it was a great reflection on the country. Every person who had a cause to be heard in the

Court of Chancery must desire to have at the head of that Court a person possessing a knowledge of Equity. It was the more necessary when there was an appellate jurisdiction in the same Judge. If a Lord Chancellor decided against the judgment of a Judge below him, there was no appeal, or nothing but an appeal from the Judge to the Judge himself. He trusted that in any remarks which he had made it would not be supposed that he referred personally to the noble and learned person lately elevated to the Woolsack. The same course pursued in his case had been previously acted upon in the case of Lord Lyndhurst. The observations, therefore, applied as strongly to Lord Lyndhurst when he was Chancellor. As to the present Lord Chancellor, no one who was in the habit of hearing him in that House but would admit that his powers of eloquence and of debate were, perhaps, never exceeded, and that he possessed great general knowledge. There was one drawback, however, to all this, which was, that the present Lord Chancellor was entirely uninformed on the law of Equity, which he was called upon to administer. Now, if the Lord Chancellor should decide wrongly in any case (and nothing was more likely), there was an appeal to the House of Lords; and who were the parties met by there? By the same Judge who had decided the case before. Not only the Court of Appeal, but the appellant jurisdiction, therefore, should be put on a different footing. The appeal should not be from the Judge to the same Judge. In the first place, then, he should propose that a sort of Equity Exchequer Chamber should be appointed, and that the Court should consist of the Lord Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, the Master of the Rolls, and the Chief Baron. He proposed also, that the Counsel should be made really responsible for the appeals which should be brought before the Court. He remembered when it was a matter which considerably reflected on a Counsel, to sign an appeal for which there were no reasonable grounds; but now that was done away with, and the most frivolous appeals were brought and heard, to the great inconvenience and loss of time of those who had cases for appeal which were really worthy of coming under the review of the appellate jurisdiction. What he should propose, therefore, was, that a moral responsibility should be restored, or created, and that it should be deemed a matter of reflection on Counsel to give their sanction to appeals for which there were no reasonable grounds. Of course, Counsel could not be made responsible for the success of their appeals, but every Counsel had it in his power to take care not to sanction an appeal for which there were no reasonable grounds. The Court being thus constituted, he would give the parties appellants, the option to go before three of these Judges, who had not before heard the cause; before the Lord Chancellor and two of the other Judges; or before the other three Judges; or to go to the House of Lords. If this plan were adopted, he was satisfied that it would stifle nine-tenths of the appeals which were now preferred, more particularly if the moral responsibility of the Counsel should be well established. Then look at the appeals from Scotland. The grounds of appeal were hardly ever investigated before they were entered in the Upper House, and they were for the most part brought, not for the sake of the difficulty of the question of law involved in them, nor on account of the value, but merely to try who should bear the expenses of a long litigation. Great improvements remained to be made in these particulars, and the time was ripe for them. Almost all these had been suggested nearly two centuries ago, but there they were still where they had been; and it was fitting that they should not remain there any longer. Many inquiries had been made with a view to these improvements, and the new Administration had great facilities in carrying them into effect. Another part of the general plan ought, in his opinion, to be, that the Lord Chancellor should have the power to call one of the Equity Judges to his assistance in cases of appeal in the House of Lords. He meant, that that Judge should sit with him, and not over him; for it was obviously inconsistent with the station which the Lord Chancellor held, and ought to hold, that he should have any Judge over him. He ought not to be under the control of any Judge. The object was, to provide that the appeal should not be to the same Judge, for an appeal to the same Judge was little else than a mockery. If the remedies which he suggested were attended to and applied, the greatest advantage would be gained, for the law would be uniform and certain. Now to pass to the consideration of Offices in the Courts, without which justice could not be done. With respect to them, his intention was of this nature: he would adapt them to the real and full discharge of the duties required by the interests of the suitors; and if it should be found that the duties could be done by smaller numbers, then he would abolish the unnecessary parts of the offices as vacancies occurred. In the Court of Chancery there were the Six Clerks (as to whom a reform had been proposed two centuries ago), who had 1,200*l.* a year, with very little duty to perform. That institution ought not to remain on its present footing. Now the Court of Chancery had no proper taxing-officers, and the duty of taxing costs, upon the plan of the Courts of Common Law, ought to devolve on these six Clerks, and costs would thus be taxed in a cheap, expeditious, and satisfactory manner. The duty had been, that one of them attended in Court in each Term, in a box, where he was sometimes employed in reading evidence; but latterly, even that duty had been dispensed with, and the attendance was to no purpose. What he should, therefore, propose was, tor elieve the Clerks from that useless attendance, and to employ the six Clerks to assist in taking accounts. The next office to which he would advert was that of the Sworn Clerk, whose services might be dispensed with, and no great inconvenience would follow. The next office was that of the Accountant-general, whose salary had been stated at 3,184*l.* It was not quite so much, however, and he did not think that any reduction ought to be made in the salary of that officer, who had most important and effective duties to perform. The next Office was the Report Office. He was never more astonished than when he saw the Return from that Office. It was a mere copying-office, and yet the allowance to the Master of the Report Office was no less than 4,589*l.*—a sum so enormous, that he scarcely could believe it to be correct; but if it was correct, it very much required to be corrected. It was absolutely necessary that the Report Office should be investigated: it ought to cost no more than about 1,200*l.* instead of between 4,000*l.* and 5,000*l.* a year. He next approached a very important office—that of the Registrar—and nothing could be worse than the system there established. The Registrar was allowed to take any number of Clerks, who each paid him about 1,000*l.* for the chance of succession, for they followed in rotation up to the highest place, without the slightest inquiry into their qualifications. Business had so accumulated that it was absolutely necessary two new Registrars should be appointed, which was one of the provisions of the bill he introduced last year. He was then authorised to say, that Lord Lyndhurst would give up the patronage annexed to the appointments; and what he proposed was, that each Judge in his own Court should name his own Registrar, taking care that he was properly qualified. He was inclined to think that they should be Barristers, and not Attorneys; but whether the one or the other, their competence ought to be duly ascertained. He did not mean to deprive of their claim those now entitled in the order of succession, but that their competence should be examined, and those only selected who were found most capable. The accumulation of business prevented the attendance of the Registrar, and this non-attendance had been the subject of just complaint. The public ought not to suffer from the appointment of new Registrars, and if four were not sufficient, six must be provided, with the same emoluments now obtained by the four. He meant to suggest, that the Registrars should attend from ten to two in the morning, and from six to eight in the evening. With respect to the framing of decrees in the Registrars' Office, it had become the practice to draw them up at an unnecessary length. At the period when pleadings were single, it was useful to state in the preamble of the decree the particulars of the case, the answer, and the prayer. But this had degenerated into a vicious system. It was customary now for the Registrar to take the Counsel's brief, and striking out such parts of it as he thought proper, and retaining such facts as he thought showed the case, to have it copied into the decree, which led to great and unnecessary expense, for it was not in the power of a Registrar to do this as it ought to be done. He proposed to leave out altogether the unnecessary preamble. He would press it upon the attention of the noble Lord opposite (Althorp), that in cutting off fees, without discrimination, which might be paid into a public fund, the country might be burthened unnecessarily with salaries which could be paid out of that fund. Thus, with respect to copies, they must be had, and there could be no objection to fees being paid for them. But the office copies, as at present drawn, were cumbrous things, and perfectly useless to the persons who took them, until they abridged them, and obtained the abstract of a copy. He proposed that these smaller copies should be procurable, and that the fee should go to a public officer, who should account to the public for them. The Registrars were now induced to make such long decrees because they were paid in fees. This evil ought at once to be remedied, by paying the Registrars out of a fund, to be formed by moderate, yet sufficient fees, to be vested in the public, and to be dealt out to the Registrars in the shape of salaries. The vast price of office copies ought also to be reduced, and they ought to be made useful to the parties, by being written in a form which rendered them legible. At present only a few words were written upon each page, so that a bill or answer extended over a vast mass of paper. The Registrars, who were mere copiers, in point of emolument were now nearly on a level with the Judges of the land, and it was quite time that their salaries were reduced. He now arrived at a still more momentous point—the Masters' Offices: they had been a subject of great and just reproach; for, though filled by most honourable, intelligent, and competent men, they were the sources of great evil. The Masters were not responsible for the abuses which were of long standing, and had been transmitted and accumulated from generation to generation. Their salaries were only 200*l.* a year, so that their principal incomes were derived from fees, and those fees were multiplied in every way by the prolongation of business before them. The first ground of complaint was, that the attendance of the Masters was not such as the public had a right to expect from the amount of remuneration. The next was, that they issued hourly warrants, which occasioned an almost indefinite repetition of them, without arriving at any thing like a decision. The consequence of this practice was, that parties were put to the expense of paying Counsel and Attorneys for attending hourly to no purpose. Thus suppose the Master had four cases to hear, he would appoint four separate hours, each hour to be appropriated to a case, which, if unfinished, was postponed to a future day; and this, though it was previously known that any one of the cases might occupy the whole four hours. Thirdly, the Masters sat, and dismissed matters submitted to them in a private chamber; and fourthly, the parties were put to a vast expense, by being compelled to take office copies. He was happy to say, that the Masters were so anxious for a reform of their offices, that the House might consider itself legislating with and not against them. He was most anxious to see those abuses put an end to, and he thought the time had now arrived when Government could do more for the benefit of the suitor in Chancery than any Government heretofore had ever an opportunity of doing. Great abuses also existed in the sales of estates; and instances had come to his knowledge where, although the fees to the Master were not exorbitant, yet, by some mismanagement, the costs of proceedings relative to the sale of an estate came, in one case, to 400*l.* and in another to 900*l.* He should propose to give the Master a fixed sum of money, instead of fees arising out of such sources. The Masters were called upon to attend the Lord Chancellor and the Master of the Rolls, which consumed their time, while it was only a mere matter of empty parade. This he would abolish, except in cases where the Chancellor or the Master of the Rolls thought it necessary for greater dignity, to require their presence, as, for instance, on the first day of Term. He did not object to their attendance on the House of Lords, of which they were the proper messengers. The first thing he would do would be, to declare their chambers open Courts, and enable them to sit as Judges, three Masters at a time, with the assistance of counsel, deciding points submitted to them. He proposed that they should so sit for three or four hours two evenings in every week, and that the causes should be regularly set down in the paper. The hours of business with the Masters had greatly varied. In remote times lawyers were in Westminster-hall at five in the morning; and even in the reign of Charles 2nd, the Masters sat from seven to twelve in the morning, and from two to six in the afternoon. In 1798 they attended from ten to three in the day, and from five to eight in the evening; in 1816 the hours of business had been reduced to seven, and at present he believed, that, on an average, they were not more than five. Thus, as the emoluments augmented, the labour was decreased. He wished to restore the time of sitting twice a week to seven hours, and if that were found too much with the present number of the Masters, he would reduce that number, by not supplying vacancies as they occurred. On the other four days of the week he would have the Masters sit only in the day time for six hours, viz. from ten until four. He next came to the question of emoluments. In 1798 the highest sum received by a Master in Chanceyr was 1,615*l*., and the lowest 976*l*., but at present the income varied between 3,800*l*. and 4,000*l*. His proposal was, that each master should have a fixed salary of 3,000*l*. per annum, giving him no interest in the prolongation of a cause, and making it the common interest of all to get the business before them done. The emoluments of the Clerks had also increased surprisingly, until they now amounted to about 1,400*l*. a year. The regular fees amounted to between 500*l*. and 600*l*. a year, and the rest was made up of gratuities for supposed expedition. His intention was, that the salaries of the Clerks should not be entirely fixed; that they should have a certain income of 600*l*., and the means of increasing it to 800*l*. by fees in matters of importance, where peculiar speed was required. Another object was, to put an end to the discrepancies in the Masters' offices; for although they were under the same roof, in every office different rules prevailed, which suitors were bound to know and observe. He wished the Masters to meet —to agree upon a general body of regulations—to submit them to the three Judges of the Courts, and with their approbation to establish them for the Government of every office, that in all, the practice might be uniform. He also highly approved of the establishment of an Accountant's-office; but he wished the Accountant to be an efficient sworn officer, who might be referred to by the Masters on points of difficulty, and to be liable to appeal from only where the sum in dispute was large, or where some question of principle was involved. By these changes he hoped to make the Masters' office as much respected as it was now reviled and censured. He was anxious, also, to avoid the expense occasioned by the taking of affidavits within twenty miles of London. If a person lived in the country, but within twenty miles of the metropolis, a Master must go to swear him, at a very heavy expense, amounting in some cases to 13*l*. 10*s*. and in others to as much as 27*l*., whereas, if the man lived at a greater distance than twenty miles, the business could be done for a mere trifle, comparatively, by a Master Extraordinary. There was another matter to which he also begged to call the attention of the House. The Registrars of the Court, who had to transact very important duties in making minutes of the transactions of the Court, &c., were generally Attorneys actually in practice. He did not object to them on the ground of ability, but he thought they ought never to be admitted, while practising, to sit under the Judge, and be the Registrars of the proceedings in the cases, perhaps, of their own clients. It was also the practice to appoint Attorneys as Secretaries for bankruptcy and lunacy; the effect of which was, in many instances, to poison the minds of the suitors, and render them dissatisfied with the Administration of Justice. He thought that the noble Lord, at present at the head of the Court of Chancery, had materially increased the evil, though he did not mean to say that it had originated with him. He certainly considered some of the appointments made by the Lord Chancellor highly objectionable, and among them those of the Secretaries, who acted as Registrars. He referred particularly to the Secretaries for lunacy and bankruptcy; the first of whom had an income of 1,300*l*. a year, and the last of not less than 2,700*l*. The noble Lord now at the head of the Court of Chancery, had much increased the evil, although he was certainly not answerable for the introduction of the abuse. Lord Eldon had appointed an attorney in great practice a Secretary and a Commissioner of lunatics, and at the time of the appointment nothing could have given greater dissatisfaction than the union of those two characters. Lord Lyndhurst had named, as Secretary of lunatics, a gentleman who was also a Solicitor of great eminence in the profession, of full business, and of high character. It was his opinion, and that from which he scarcely imagined he should experience any dissent, namely, that no Solicitor should hold a situation in the Court of Chancery, which might supply a temptation to litigants to employ him in preference to others, from a hope that doing so might lead to a favourable decision. The appointment of the Secretary for bankrupts was particularly open to the force of that observation. With respect to the lately-appointed Secretary for bankrupt cases, he had this much to state, namely, that that gentleman did not think himself at liberty to practise, yet he thought his partner quite free to do so; and now he would ask the House, wherein the difference was to be found, between the influence which any man might exert—he would say might be supposed by suitors to exert—over the decisions of the Court, when he acted for himself alone, or by his partner. In adverting to those topics, he begged it to be understood that he meant no hostile allusion to the character or conduct of the present Keeper of the Great Seal. He then, in expressing his sense of the high qualifications of Lord Brougham, professed that he was not influenced by any other than strict considerations of public duty. [*Here some remark made behind him called off the attention of the hon. and learned Member.*] He said, he could not avoid hearing the hon. member for Middlesex say, "here's a splash." He contended for his right of making the observations which he was making, and in the manner he adopted, without being made the subject of that sort of animadversion. He then proceeded to say, that he hoped some course would be adopted to facilitate the great work of accomplishing a Reform in the Court of Chancery. Nothing, he was satisfied, would prove more acceptable to the country at large, than to put the Court of Chancery on a sound and advantageous footing. He could assure those hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, from whom such a reform was expected, that they should experience no opposition on his side of the House. He could assure them, that neither he nor any of his hon. friends would take up the matter upon grounds of party or of faction; but deal with it as fairly, and with as much disposition to effect improvement, as if the proposed alterations had originated with themselves. He concluded by moving "That there be laid before the House an account of the number of Appeal Cases, Bills, Demurrers, Exceptions, and Further Directions, which stood before the Lord Chancellor or the Vice-Chancellor, on the 6th November, 1830."

Mr. *M. A. Taylor* said, he had too much compassion, though he felt none for the hon. Gentlemen who usually sat below him, but who were not now in their places, to detain the House by entering then into the abuses of the Court of Chancery. With the speech which they had just heard, or rather, with the results which it was likely to produce, if there was one man in the country who ought more than another to be gratified with them, that man was himself. Of all the abuses of the Court of Chancery he had told them, or rather not all, but some—merely a few; but now he had the satisfaction of hearing the hon. and learned Gentleman below him calling upon his Majesty's Government to bring forward the necessary alterations—now for the first time it was admitted on all hands, that alterations were necessary—while it must be full in the recollection of the House, that the late Lord Chancellor, in the course of the last Session, brought in two bills, which he abandoned, and that the hon. and learned Gentleman himself also abandoned his own measures of last year. As to what had been said in reference to the appointments made by the present Lord Chancellor, he had only to observe, that that noble Lord had done nothing but what had been sanctioned by the example of every one of his predecessors; and why should not he, as they had done, surround himself with men of honour and character, in whom he could confide? He was enabled to say this—that Mr. Vizard, the Secretary for Bankruptcy, assured the Lord Chancellor, that he would no longer practise in cases of bankruptcy or lunacy. Once more he would congratulate the House, and he trusted he might in a peculiar degree felicitate himself, that at length the country would, by common consent of all parties, enjoy the benefits of reform. For very obvious reasons, the House must feel the impossibility of his entering into the various matters which the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman presented for consideration, and therefore he thought he should best promote the object which he earnestly pursued, by moving that the debate be adjourned to Monday next.

The *Attorney General*, in seconding the Motion for adjournment, said, that though his hon. and learned friend had, in some respects, censured the conduct of the present Lord Chancellor, he had not advised his noble predecessor, though a member of the same Government with his hon. friend the member for Weymouth, to avoid that course for which he was now censuring the present Lord Chancellor. His noble friend had, in the several appointments which he made, only followed the example which had been set him by Lords Thurlow and Erskine, by Lord Eldon, and by every Keeper of the Great Seal. It could not be for a moment denied, that the present Lord Chancellor had great difficulties to contend against; and though, in meeting those difficulties, he had felt himself called upon to appoint those, and none but those, on whom he could rely, yet in the case of two gentlemen connected with his Court, the giving away of whose offices would have been to him a source of considerable patronage, he had not availed himself of his unquestionable power and authority, but had permitted those gentlemen to remain in the situations in which he found them. Not an iota of patronage had he availed himself of for the benefit of any one of his connexions. Now, more especially with respect to his private Secretary, the fact was, that antecedently to that gentleman's appointment, the Lord Chancellor had not the slightest knowledge of him, and merely received him into that office from recommendations which gave him assurance that the gentleman was well qualified. As to the other Secretaries, respecting whom some observations had been made, he must be allowed to say, that the noble Lord had no other choice but to appoint Solicitors. It might be extremely desireable, if Barristers could be found to fill them, to appoint gentlemen belonging to that branch of the profession; but there were few Barristers, sufficiently well qualified, who would give up their profession for the hazardous situation in question. Under all the circumstances, he hoped his hon. friend would permit him to say, that it would have been rather better for him to have waited a few months, to see what the Lord Chancellor could do, than thus to appear against him with what he might be permitted to call premature condemnation. On occasions such as that, other persons, having to speak of the present Lord Chancellor under the circumstances in which he had to mention his name, might feel called on to pronounce a splendid panegyric—he was, he trusted, incapable of betraying so much bad taste, but he would entreat the House and the country to look to the conduct of the noble Lord; and though he might not be so practised an Equity lawyer as the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, yet he confessed that he should feel himself most grievously mistaken if his noble friend did not turn out to be one of the greatest Equity Judges, and one of the greatest Equity Lawyers, that ever presided in the Court of Chancery; if he did not, in a word, equal all the expectations which that House had formed of him—if he did not fulfil all that was hoped from a man to whom no subject was too great for his comprehension, nor any detail too minute to elude his research. Of this at least he was certain, that no one ever entered the Court of Chancery with a more sincere and earnest disposition to advance the great work of reform, and to put an end to the abuses of that Court. He really was unable to comprehend, from what had been said respecting the appellate jurisdiction, that it at all applied in any degree to the present question. That an appeal to the House of Lords would have been an appeal from the Lord Chancellor to the Lord Chancellor any more in present times than it was at former periods, appeared to him incomprehensible. Surely there were as many Law Lords now as at any former periods and as able. There was no decision to which the present Lord Chancellor might come, which, being appealed from, would not come under the consideration of Lords Eldon, Lyndhurst, and Wynford. With respect to his learned friend's remarks on the evils of the Vice-Chancellor's Court, there was nothing new in them. The disadvantages of that Court were pointed out by Sir Samuel Romilly, when it was first proposed to erect it. He could not conclude without observing, that whatever reforms might be effected in the Court of Chancery, all the honour belonged to his hon. friend, the member for Durham, who had taken up the subject year after year. It was said, that it had been brought forward for party purposes. He repelled the accusation. It was brought forward from the impulse of public spirit; and it was unjust to say, that it was introduced merely because a great judicial character happened also to be a great political character. It was not brought forward in 1810 for party purposes, but it was then defeated on account of party and political feelings. He could not see why, as his hon. and learned friend the member for Stafford had said, he could not see why reforms of this kind should be thrown on the Cabinet, who had such multifarious business to dispose of. He considered that it was more proper to leave them to his learned friend and others, who had given so much of their time and attention to the task. He was sure, that if they introduced useful reforms, they might rely on the support of every Member of that House, and particularly on that of every Member of his Majesty's Government.

Sir *E. B. Sugden*, in explanation, said, he was no friend of the Lord Chancellor, and did not feel that he was authorised to intrude, in order to tell him what he meant to say in that House. In making the observations which he had addressed to the House, he was merely actuated by his feelings as a public man. He had a duty to perform, and he would perform it; he had a station to uphold, and he would uphold it.

Sir *C. Wetherell* said, the practice always had been, to appoint Solicitors to the situation of Secretaries. When Lord Macclesfield was impeached, every thing that could be was alleged against him; but his appointment of Solicitors as Secretaries was not amongst the charges; and it was, therefore, to be inferred, that there was nothing improper in it. He did not know whether his learned friend meant to introduce a clause in some bill to prohibit the Chancellor from appointing whom he pleased as Secretaries. If he did, he thought that that Chancellor would not be a very spirited man who submitted to be over-ruled by such a clause. The present Lord Chancellor, as his learned friend the Attorney General had said, had done no more than a long series of his predecessors had done.

Mr. *Hume* begged to explain to the hon. member for Weymouth (Sir E. B Sugden) that what he had said, and what the hon. Gentleman had overheard, had been addressed privately to a friend that sat next him, and not at all intended to interfere with his speech. His friend had asked him, on what the motion was? To which his reply was, that it was not a motion, it was only a splash. If the hon. member for Weymouth wished to know what a splash meant, he would tell him: he meant a speech on a subject, but no motion on the speech. The hon. and learned Gentleman had been three years in office without ever complaining of the abuses of the Court of Chancery; and now, with the greatest inconsistency, he made an attack upon Lord Brougham, who had scarcely taken his seat, for permitting abuses. Of the speech of the Attorney General he must say, that since he had been in the House, he had never heard a speech from a lawyer which had given him so much satisfaction. His speech did honour to him as a lawyer, and would be gratifying to the public. He was sure that the hon. and learned Gentleman would not, like his predecessor, defer complaints till his removal from office.

Sir *E. Sugden* said, that whilst he was in power, he had given due notice of this motion.

The Debate adjourned till Monday.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, Dec. 17.

Minutes.] The Patents Continuation Bill was brought up from the Commons.

Petitions presented. For the abolition of Slavery, by the Bishop of London, from Wetherfield:—By the Duke of Richmond, the Marquis of Bristol, Lord King, Lord Auckland, and Lord Calthorpe, from various Congregations of Protestant Dissenters. By the Duke of Devonshire, from Youghall, against the repeal of the Union. By Lord King, from Saffron-hill, against the New Police. By the Duke of Richmond, from several Parishes in Sussex, against the Malt-Tax. By the Marquis of Clanricarde, from the working Carpenters of Dublin, for the repeal of the Union; and from Moycullen, against the Grants to the Kildare-street Society.

Reform in Church and State.] Lord *King* said, he rose to present several petitions upon the distresses of the country, and upon the subject of Reform. Some of these petitions were from Scotland, and some from England, but they all concurred in demanding cheap government, cheap law, cheap corn, cheap coals, a free trade, and a reform in Parliament. These summed up made the six great wants of the country at the present moment. There was something peculiar in one of the petitions from Scotland, to which he would presently advert. The first petition was from Ashfield, Nottingham, and it prayed for a Reform of all abuses in Church and State—a pretty extensive latitude of petitioning. The next was from Saffron-hill, and it was against the Assessed taxes. The next petition was from Scotland, and he would say, that if it were acknowledged that there were faults in the representation of England, all who made the acknowledgment must confess that the representation of Scotland was a perfect farce, a vile mockery, and in every point of view an insult to the understanding, to the moral sense, and national character of the people. The perfection of the Scotch representation was so great, that it exceeded the imagination of all mankind, and even of the noble Duke opposite (Wellington), to conceive any thing beyond it. He would now present two of the Scotch petitions, the one was from Arbroath, and the other was from the county of Renfrew. This latter petition was certainly not very intelligibly worded, and it contained a passage against which he had been informed that their Lordships might possibly take some objections. In the first place, the Petitioners entreated their Lordships to counsel the people, which was what their Lordships did not often do. But the next was, that their Lordships were not only to counsel the people, but they were to counsel them not to submit to unconstitutional representatives imposing unnecessary taxation. He did not think that this was language which ought to prevent the reception of the petition by the House, nor did he think it ought to induce their Lordships not to pay attention to the prayer of the petitioners. There were some parts of the petition which certainly were not very intelligible; but if their Lordships came to a resolution of rejecting petitions because they were not intelligible, he was afraid that the right of petitioning Parliament would be very sensibly abridged. He should now move, that the Petition be laid on the Table.

The Earl of *Haddington* said, that after the specimen which the noble Baron had given of the language of the petition, he thought it necessary to move that the petition be read at length.

The Petition having been read,

The Earl of *Haddington* requested his noble Friend to consent to withdraw the petition. He had no wish to impede the practice of petitioning that House, and much less did he wish to throw any obstacle in the way of receiving the present petition, as it was the first of the sort that had as yet been received from a Scotch county; but he objected to the language of the petition, and he trusted that his noble friend would consent to withdraw it.

Lord *King* did not think the petition of so objectionable a nature that he was authorized to withdraw it. The petition had been agreed to at a county meeting. It certainly did not look as if it came from Scotland, for parts of it were not intelligible, and it prayed their Lordships to counsel the people, the very last thing which their Lordships would do. As the petition likewise prayed for relief against excessive taxation, which part of the petition was perfectly intelligible, he could not consent to withdraw it.

Lord *Duncan* would bear testimony to the increasing anxiety of the people of Scotland upon the subject of reform. The sense of the absolute necessity of a reform was gaining ground rapidly amongst every class of people throughout Scotland. The whole thirty county Members of Scotland were elected by less than 3,000 voters. The boroughs in Scotland were in a much worse condition than the counties with respect to the representation, and even for Edinburgh, which contained 130,000, the Member was returned by only thirty-three voters. Since the last census, the population of Scotland had much increased; and, taking the lower and middling orders of society throughout the country, there was as much information as in the same class of any population throughout Europe; and he would put it to their Lordships whether it was possible that such a people could be blind to their absolute degradation, under the present system of returning Members to Parliament. The people of Scotland, it was true, had hitherto been silent upon the subject, but let not noble Lords imagine that it was the silence of apathy, for it had been that of hopelessness and despair. His Majesty, most fortunately for the safety of the country, had been pleased to put at the head of the Government, a nobleman long celebrated for his wisdom, as well as for being the friend of reform; and this fact had revived the wishes of Scotland, which had previously been dormant. He would avow that he had confidence in the noble Earl's intention to effect a reform; and he knew that before many weeks their Lordships' Table would be covered with petitions from Scotland in support of that measure.

Lord *Ellenborough* did not see any reason why the petition should not be received by their Lordships. That was not the time to discuss questions of reform; and, therefore, he would say nothing on the subject, but as to the petition, as it came from a county of Scotland, and there was nothing very objectionable in its language, he for one would vote that it be received.

Earl *Grey* thought that the petition might have been better worded. He was always extremely unwilling to take harsh or illiberal measures with respect to petitions, and in the present case he was very unwilling to object to the petition, but he could not but consider it improper for any petitioners to urge their Lordships to advise the people to resist the other House of Parliament as a body of representatives illegally and unconstitutionally chosen. This, in his opinion, was going rather beyond the usual language of petitions, and he should object to receiving it, on the ground that it called upon their Lordships to give advice to the people to exert a resistance to legal authority. He did hope that his noble friend would adopt the suggestion that had been thrown out, and withdraw the petition.

Lord *King* would not wish to press the petition against the views of the noble Earl, and he would therefore consent to withdraw it.

The Earl of *Haddington* concurred with the noble Earl that it was not the duty of the House to throw impediments in the way of petitions coming from Scotland or elsewhere: but certainly a petition which called on their Lordships "to counsel the people to resist the other House of Parliament" could not be well received. There was a growing feeling in favour of reform in Scotland, particularly in the manufacturing districts; but the agricultural districts were as yet not affected by any strong feelings; and in those districts, at least, men's minds had not been drawn much to the subject. He could not, therefore, help thinking that the picture drawn of the state of feeling by a noble Lord near him was nearly or quite as much overcharged, as it had been undercharged by those who took the contrary side. Whatever the case might be in the manufacturing districts, in the country parts there was nothing like the same extensive feeling of reform which he thought, and, in his opinion, unhappily, existed in England. For his part he believed the old system worked well; and, though there were anomalies in it, perhaps it was the better on that account. At least the old system contented the people of England down to a late period; but any man must be stricken with more than judicial blindness who did not see that the mind of the country was changed on the subject, and that the question must be discussed until it was brought to the point which would give content to the respectable part of the community, and allow a stand to be made against those who did not seek the preservation of the constitution, but its destruction, and who looked not for reform, but for revolution. Whatever might be his abstract opinion on the subject, he would keep his mind open to reason and argument, and, while he avoided pledging himself to any side, he was determined to come to the consideration of reform with an anxious desire to give his confidence to the noble Lord.

The Earl of *Fife* said, that although the schoolmaster was abroad, yet the language in the petition was far from being that which was becoming the freeholders of a great Scotch county; but still he thought that considering the language used in that House, and in the other House, and in the petitions presented, and at public meetings, that a little more latitude might be given in the present case. He hoped, as the petition was withdrawn, that some one would suggest to those who were to send another in its stead, either here or to the other House, that it would be well to embody in the latter a recommendation to the election committees of the House to investigate the cases of alleged misconduct then before it, as they might be thereby enabled to give Ministers an opportunity of affording to large towns that representation to which it was admitted they were entitled.

Petition withdrawn.

Lord *King*, in presenting a Petition of a similar nature from Perth, denied that the Scotch system of representation worked well for the people of Scotland; though it certainly worked well for those who enjoyed the monopoly of it, and who possessed thereby the power of laying on the taxes. He denied that the object of those who called for Reform was revolution, and he maintained, that the enlisting of the middle classes in the cause of Reform was the best and only security against revolution in the present character of the times.

The Earl of *Haddington* explained, that his remark as to the working well of the present system of representation was not applied to Scotland particularly, but was applied to the general system of representation throughout the empire.

The Marquis of *Bute* denied, that the people of Scotland felt themselves oppressed or degraded. When he heard such a statement made in proof that the people of Scotland wanted reform, he altogether doubted that they entertained any such desire. He contended, that Scotland was well satisfied with her Representatives, or that their Lordships would have heard to the contrary long since. It was a new thing to hear it said, that the people of Scotland were not well represented. [" *Hear, hear," from Lord King.*] The noble Lord might cry " Hear, hear," but, in fact, the old story was, that the people of Scotland were too well represented, for they had been accustomed to hear of nothing but Scotch jobs.

Lord *Duncan*, as a proof that the people of Scotland were not well represented, stated, that a few years ago the Lord Advocate and a majority of the Scotch Representatives voted against the removal of a stigma upon the Presbyterians.

The Earl of *Darnley* concurred with the noble Lord (Ellenborough) in the opinion that this was not the proper occasion for discussing the question of Reform. At the same time he wished to state, that he always felt convinced, that there was much in the representation of the people in the other House of Parliament which required reform. He was persuaded that the question of Reform could not now be evaded or delayed. He would advise his noble friend at the head of his Majesty's Government, and their Lordships, not to refrain, through the fear of going too far, from doing that which was necessary to satisfy the public mind in this eventful crisis. He was sure that their Lordships would have more to answer for than any other persons in the empire, if they did not satisfy the public expectations upon the question of Reform. To effect that there must be some sacrifices, and he was confident they would not satisfy the public expectations if the direct nomination of Members of the House of Commons by Peers were not taken away.

The Petition, which was from the Incorporation of Bakers, in Perth, laid on the Table.

NORFOLK CIRCUIT — LORD CHANCELLOR'S PATRONAGE.] Lord *Calthorpe* wished to put a question to the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, with regard to the Norfolk Circuit. That Circuit had experieneed considerable and singular inconvenience for some years, owing to the circumstance of only one Judge of Assize going that Circuit. Such had been, unhappily, the increase of offences latterly, that the most serious inconvenience and injury had arisen from there being but a single Judge on that Circuit to discharge the various duties which devolved upon him. He wished to know from the noble and learned Lord, now that some additional Judges had been appointed, if it was intended to make any arrangement to remedy that inconvenience?

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that the subject adverted to by the noble Lord was certainly one of great importance; and, undoubtedly, serious inconvenience had been felt for many years from the want of two Judges going the Norfolk Circuit in Spring and Autumn. He (the Lord Chancellor) was one of those who deeply regretted such an inconvenience, and who only submitted to it from the necessity of the case, there being too few Judges to do the business of the country. Twelve Judges had been long considered sufficient; but now that three additional Judges had been appointed by his Majesty's late Government, with the sanction of the whole profession, and in conformity with the wishes of the public, there was no pretence whatever that only one Judge should go the Norfolk circuit. He saw no reason why it should not be otherwise: perhaps some persons better acquainted with the matter might think that the old arrangement should continue, but for his part, he (the Lord Chancellor) could not discover the shadow of a reason why the evil complained of should not be remedied. Two of the additional Judges would be allotted to the new circuit which had been made, and one would be thus left unappropriated. Now, he would say, and the person who held the Great Seal had usually a voice in such a matter, that it would be better that two Judges should go the Norfolk Spring Circuit, and that for that purpose the additional Judge left unappropriated should be selected. He was of opinion, that it was not seemly that either the Norfolk circuit or the Midland circuit, should have one Judge assisted by a Serjeant or some other makeshift, when the country had now provided individuals of the highest legal attainments and character. He might, perhaps, be permitted to take that opportunity to advert to some suggestions which he understood had been thrown out elsewhere, respecting certain appointments vested in the hands of the Lord Chancellor, The suggestions to which he alluded regarded the Court of Chancery, and the disposal of the patronage of the Great Seal; and, as they had been described as worthy of his attention, he should give them all the consideration which they deserved. It had been said in another place, that he had taken upon himself to name an Attorney to a place which would be more fitly filled by a Barrister. He certainly felt the propriety of that suggestion, and he had endeavoured to fill the places, the disposal of the appointments to which was vested in him, with Barristers. But the great difficulty to be encountered in accomplishing that object arose from this circumstance—that the Great Seal was only held during pleasure, and that on the Lord Chancellor's going out, his Secretary, and the other officers whom he might have appointed, were turned out with him. It was impossible, therefore, for the Lord Chancellor to call upon a Barrister to sacrifice his profession for a place of that uncertain description, and to leave the Bar, for perhaps only a few years, or a few months. On the other hand, it required a person of considerable experience in business, to discharge the great and important duties attached to the office of Secretary in the Court of Chancery. It was absolutely necessary, for the proper administration of justice, that the office should be filled by a person of experience, and no Barrister of experience would accept of it. He had tried in vain to get an experienced Barrister to take it. Now if the place were given to an inexperienced Barrister, the duties would not be performed, and thus would arise a great and grand evil, worse by many degrees than the mischief complained of respecting the appointment of Solicitors,—namely, that it was giving them an undue means of showing favour to the suitors in the Court in which they practised. He begged to state, that the persons filling the situations alluded to, in the departments to which he had the power to appoint, had renounced all their private professional practice in the departments in which they were employed under the Great Seal. But if a Barrister, who intended to go back to his profession, filled one of those situations, there might be great danger of his making friends amongst the suitors in the Court, in order that he might have their aid when he returned to his profession. He spoke only of what might possibly occur, constitutd as human nature was. That certainly was felt by his predecessors, and the offices to which allusion had been made had been held by Solicitors very recently, with the exception of one place. He did not suppose that any charge was intended to be made against him with regard to the general disposal of the patronage attached to his office. No man could consider that patronage a greater burthen than he did; and there was nothing he wished more to get rid of. It was the usual practice when a new Lord Chancellor was appointed, to dismiss all the individuals who held offices under his predecessors; but when he was appointed to hold the Great Seal, his first observation was, that he would not dismiss one of the individuals who held office under the former Lord Chancellor. He was told, however, that it was absolutely necessary to dismiss two confidential Secretaries, which he did because it would have been improper to retain men acquainted with matters confidentially intrusted to them by his predecessor; he retained, however, five out of seven persons who filled situations under his predecessor, and one of them, a learned gentleman whom he had appointed to a particular office, he had never seen until he came to thank him for having appointed him. He could declare, that no human being that he had ever known or seen before, had received an appointment from him in Church or State, with the exception of two individuals, from private motives, and the nature of those motives, he was sure, would be properly appreciated by their Lordships and the public, when he mentioned the names of Romilly and Clarkson, as those of two persons whom he had so appointed Commissioners of Bankrupts.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, Dec. 17.

MINUTES.] An Election Committee reported, that M. BRUCE, Esq., and JAMES J. H. VERE, Esq., the sitting Members, were duly elected for the Borough of Ilchester.

Bills. The Patents Continuation Bill was read a third time and passed. The Labouring Poor Bill (Lord NUGENT'S measure) was postponed till February 10th.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. LENNARD, of the number of Persons convicted of, and executed for Forgery, during the year 1830:—On the Motion of Mr. Alderman WAITHMAN, Manufactured Cottons exported since 1798, distinguishing the real from the official value, and stating Duties and Drawbacks:—On the Motion of Mr. HUME, various Returns connected with the Duties on Houses and Windows; account of all the Houses and Buildings in the Royal Parks; of the names and occupations of the Persons by whom they were filled; and whether they were rated to the Assessed Taxes and County Rate; a Copy of the original Patent by which Mr. J. A. Sullivan was appointed to the office of Secretary and Registrar and King's Receiver for the Colony of Demerara—a return of his age—the date of his appointment—the period during which he had exercised the office as principal, and during which he discharged its duties by deputy—the amount of the money he had received, with interest and compound interest on his receipts, calculated at five per cent—the amount of money paid to him as principal money in each year—the amount of the payments to his deputies up to the present period:—On the Motion of Mr. BULLER, the Population of each Hundred in the Empire, with its extent of surface:—On the Motion of Lord J. RUSSELL, the rates of Duties payable on Soap, Candles, Coals, &c. in 1792, and on January 1st, 1831, with the value of the Cottons, Woollens, and Cutlery exported at the two periods, distinguishing the official from the real value; the Prices of Meat and Bread paid at Greenwich Hospital in 1790, 1791, 1792, and in 1828, 1829, and 1830.

Petitions presented. For the repeal of the Duty on Printed Cottons, by Mr. PATTEN, from Burnley, Lancashire, and Stayley Bridge:—By Mr. GREENE, from Lancaster. For a Reform in Parliament, by Mr. LESTER, from Poole. For the repeal of the Assessed Taxes, by Mr. H. DAVIS, from several Parishes in Bristol:—By Mr. LABOUCHERE, from Taunton. Against the Duty on Sea-borne Coals, by Lord J. STUART, from Neath, Glamorganshire. For the abolition of Colonial Slavery, thirteen by Mr. HUME:—By Mr. SLANEY, three from Shrewsbury and its neighbourhood:—By Mr. BLOUNT, from Roman Catholics of Sheffield:—By Lord J. STUART, from Glamorganshire:—By Mr. C. RUSSEL, from Dissenters at Hatch Beauchamp:—By Mr. BULLER, from East and West Looe:—By Mr. PATTEN, from Shrewsbury:—By Mr. TALBOT, eight from Glamorganshire:—By Sir J. SEBRIGHT, three from various parts of Devonshire. By Mr. HUME, from the Magistrates, &c. of Arbroath, complaining of the delay and expense now occasioned by the Quarantine Laws. By Sir M. W. RIDLEY, from those who constituted the Deputation of the Procession of Trades which lately went with an Address to the King, denying that they had used a tricoloured Flag, making warm professions of loyalty, and praying an inquiry into their conduct. By Mr. LUMLEY, from Mansfield, against the Truck System; and from an individual, named Benjamin Ellis, against the Corn Laws. By O'GORMAN MAHON, from Drumline, in the Barony of Bunralty, in the County of Clare, against the Subletting Act.

PRIVILEGES OF PARLIAMENT—BOROUGH OF BEERALSTON.] Mr. *Leader* moved, that the Speaker do issue his warrant for a new Writ for this borough, in the room of Lord Louvain, now Earl of Beverley. The hon. Member said, that the Speaker having inquired, when the subject was mentioned to him yesterday, whether the usual words "now summoned up to the other House of Parliament" were added to the Motion, and having been answered in the negative, that he was pleased then to recommend that reference should be made to precedents, for the purpose of seeing whether such addition to the terms of the Motion was not essential. The first authority to which he had accordingly referred was that contained in '*Hatsell's Precedents*' where it is laid down, "that a person becomes a Peer by descent or by creation. When by the former, the instant the ancestor dies his heir becomes a Peer, and his seat in the House of Commons is immediately vacant; and there is no necessity to wait for the issuing of the Writ to call such heir to the House of Peers; for it is only a Writ of Summons to attend his service there; and without it, and though he should never take his seat there, he is to all intents and purposes whatsoever a Peer of the realm; and if in some particular case, or to answer any particular purpose, this Writ of Summons should be delayed to be issued, the House of Commons would, nevertheless, consider his seat amongst them as vacated, and would order a new Writ. In the case of the late Lord Carlisle, when, upon the death of his father, a new Writ was moved, the Speaker said, he had asked the mover of it whether the Writ of Summons had issued? but that this proceeded from curiosity—his seat in the House of Commons being vacant whether it had issued or not." The next precedent upon which he (Mr. Leader) relied, was the decision of the House of Commons itself on a recent occasion, in the Berkeley case, where a motion was made in 1811 for a Writ for a Member to serve in Parliament for the county of Gloucester, in the room of Viscount Dursley, then Earl Berkeley; and the hon. Member produced also the Journals of the House of Commons of that day, in which the House decided, on a division precisely under the circumstances of the present case, that the Writ should issue. The hon. Member then referred to '*Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*,' and recurred to the arguments which were then used, and on which he relied as perfectly in point with the present case. It was stated in the proceedings of that day that Mr. Speaker had cited a variety of instances, and directed the Clerk to read certain passages from the Journals relative to the issuing of the writ for Stamford, in the room of General Barclay, then Earl Lindsay; and he contended that the words "summoned to Parliament" were essential. It was then contended by the mover for the Writ, that a summons was not necessary—that the county of Gloucester, in that event, might go unrepresented for months, or till the end of Parliament. It was argued on the other side, that if they went into the subject a Committee of Privileges must be appointed to ascertain whether or not he had the right. Several gentlemen at that time contended, that the question was not how Lord Dursley was affected, but how the House of Commons was affected; they contended also, that a peerage rendered a person incapable of sitting in that House: and it was likewise strongly urged that it was a mere question as to form, and though forms ought to be properly attended to, still Gloucester ought not to be deprived of its share in the representation for form's sake. He contended, therefore, that this was the dictum of the most eminent parliamentary authority, and the precedent of the House itself, for in the Gloucester case, the writ was issued as the motion was granted. Under these circumstances, he felt strongly that the first duty of the House was to fill up the vacancies in their own body. Lord Louvain was disqualified for sitting there, and, consequently, the borough of Beeralston ceased to be represented in that House. He, therefore, moved for a Writ for a new Election for the borough of Beeralston.

The *Speaker* said, he was sure that the House would expect, and that the hon. Member would not only pardon him if he addressed them on this subject, but that they would all think that, on such a question, he was called upon to make some observations upon the motion of the hon. Member, and upon the grounds on which the hon. Member had founded his Motion. The Motion was, that a new Writ be issued for a certain borough, in the room of a person who was alleged by the hon. Mover to have ceased to be a Member of this House in consequence of his having, by the death of his father, succeeded to the peerage. Now, it must be quite clear to every hon. Member, that if the person alluded to was not a Peer, his place was not vacant, for no other ground of vacancy had been alleged. Such being the motion of the hon. Member, the hon. Member had said, that he would cite precedents and authorities to show that the House might, in such a case, order a new Writ, without a summons having been issued by the other House to the person situated as the hon. Member had described the member for this borough to be. He had carefully watched the hon. Member during the course of his argument, and the fulfilment of his pledge to produce authorities in support of his Motion. The hon. Member had first produced *dicta*—from a book of great authority he was ready to admit, but still only *dicta*—in support of this petition,—namely, that in such a case as the hon. Member had stated, it was not necessary that a summons should issue from the other House in order to unseat the person so situated as the member for Beeralston was said to be. There could certainly be no doubt, that if a Member of that House became a Peer, the House could order a new Writ to be issued in his room, and, consequently, unseat him, without the House of Lords having issued such summons; but then the House would require evidence—positive evidence—that such Member had really become a Peer. This had been the uniform course. The House must have proof,—sufficient proof,—and it was true that the issue of a summons by the other House was not essential to the sufficiency of proof. The issue of such summons alone would be sufficient proof—it had always been taken as such; but it did not follow from that, that the House might not have sufficient proof without the summons. For instance, if the House of Lords thought proper to refuse to issue the summons; or, if they were negligent in issuing the summons, such conduct on the part of the Lords could not estop the House of Commons from doing that which the law of the land justified them in doing,—nay, called upon them to do. The House of Commons, however, he repeated, must have sufficient evidence of the fact that the person had become a Peer. The result, then, of these observations, the House would see, was this,—namely, that the *dicta* which the hon. Member had cited were quite true; or, in other words, that the issue of the summons by the House of Lords was not the only conclusive evidence of a person having become a Peer. There might be other evidence of the same fact. Then, with regard to precedents, the hon. Member had cited only one, and that was the case in which a new Writ had been issued for Gloucester, in the room of Colonel Berkeley. Now to this case he entreated the attention of hon. Members, as well of those who had been Members of the House at the time that case occurred, as of those who had not then the honour of seats there. A single glance at the circumstances of that case would convince hon. Members that the Writ had been wrongfully issued. He had no hesitation in saying wrongfully; for the individual in whose room the Writ was directed to issue was still living, and was Colonel Berkeley, and not Earl of Berkeley. This precedent, therefore, would not, he was sure, be acted upon by the House; and thus they had got rid of the only case which the hon. Member had cited. Having thus gone through the grounds on which the hon. Member rested his Motion, let him call the attention of the House to the real aspect of the case. The House required proof that the seat was vacant. What proof had been adduced? None whatever; and if the House chose to entertain the Motion, they must, as the summons had not been issued by the other House, go into a solemn inquiry respecting birth, parentage, and right. This was the only course open to the House,—the only course they could pursue in any case so circumstanced as the present case was. With regard to this particular case, however, allow him to observe that he had felt it his duty to take all the steps that he could with propriety take, for procuring information, in order to direct the proceedings, as well of the hon. Member who had brought forward the Motion, as of the House who were to decide upon that Motion. The facts of the case, as he had been informed, were these:—the hon. Member, in whose room a Writ was now moved for, was abroad,—at Rome,—and in consequence of his absence, some obstacles had presented themselves to the issue of the summons from the other House; but the summons had been applied for; that application was before the Lord Chancellor, and in a few days it was expected the application would be decided upon. Under these circumstances, which he had felt it his duty to state, he put it to the hon. Member, and to the House, whether it would not be prudent to wait the result of the application to the Lord Chancellor, rather than commence such an inquiry as would alone justify the House in unseating one of their Members. However, if the hon. Member felt inclined to press the Motion, he would of course put it.

Mr. *Hume* hoped the hon. Member would not think of pressing his Motion, after what had fallen from the Chair.

Sir *G. Warrender* would recommend the hon. Member to withdraw the Motion. He had been one of the majority in the case of Colonel Berkeley; and he should be very cautious how he committed himself in the same way a second time.

Mr. *Leader* said, that after the communication which had been made by Mr. Speaker, he could not think of pressing the Motion.—Motion withdrawn.

TAX ON PRINTED COTTONS.] Mr. *Patten* presented petitions, very numerously signed from Manchester and its vicinity, praying for the Repeal of the duty on Printed Cottons. The hon. Member said, that this tax weighed most heavily and most injuriously upon the lower orders, and declared his intention of bringing the subject before the House, by moving that the duty be repealed, immediately after the recess. The duty on printed calicoes amounted to more than 1,000,000*l.* and not 400,000*l.* of that went into the Exchequer, in consequence of the numerous drawbacks, and the expense of collecting. The petitioners stated, that it diminished their profits thirty per cent, as well as being most vexatious. The labouring classes paid a duty of sixty or seventy per cent, while the dresses of the upper classes were not taxed above three per cent.

Mr. *Hume* supported the prayer of the petitions. The tax upon printed cottons was most unequal and unjust, and it was fast destroying that branch of manufacture. This tax caused the garments of the poor to pay a duty of sixty per cent, while the garments of the rich did not pay a duty of more than five or six per cent. The extent of cotton-printing was at the rate of 300,000 or 400,000 pieces in the year. There were two millions of money in the gross collected from this duty, of which 500,000*l.* annually came into the Exchequer, and out of which 100,000*l.* was paid for the expenses of collection, leaving only 400,000*l.* to the revenue, which was taken out of the pockets of the great body of the people. Calico printing employed one-tenth of the inhabitants of Lancashire, and in Glasgow it was fast going down, in consequence of this tax, while the rival manufactures of ginghams and cotton-yarn were rising into prosperity. This was a tax that was levied on the industry of the people of England, and it ought to be repealed.

Mr. *Greene* also bore testimony to the oppressive nature of this duty. It was extremely expensive to collect, and bore particularly hard upon the poorer classes, and he was anxious to have it repealed.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* said, that this was another instance of the cruel manner in which the poor were taxed. He had no doubt that the industrious classes of the community bore at least four-fifths of the gross taxation of the country; and he should be glad to see a committee appointed, for the purpose of tracing the injurious operation of our fiscal code on the labouring population. The personal property of a man who had accumulated a few thousand pounds by a life of unremitted industry, was subject, at his death, to an enormous impost, while the real estate of the great land-owner did not pay a farthing.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* had personal experience of the oppressive nature of this tax, and he had repeatedly brought the subject under the notice of the House, but no attention had been paid to him.

Mr. *Dugdale* concurred in the observations which had been made on this subject, and supported the prayer of the petitions.

Sir *John Newport* did not deny that this was a most oppressive tax, but there was also a still more oppressive and unjust tax, which he was of opinion ought, in the first instance, to be repealed—he alluded to the duty on coals. He had no doubt that the tax now under discussion was, like many others, an ill-regulated tax; but the question was, whether it and others could be repealed without any serious defalcation in the revenue. He was of opinion that the coal-duty was a still more oppressive, and far worse tax, and if they were to take away any taxes, they should first commence with one which pressed so very heavily upon the public. If they could not repeal the tax in question along with the coal-tax, consistently with a due attempt to keep up the public revenue of the country, he would certainly be for selecting the coal-tax for repeal; it was a most unjust and oppressive tax, for it bore harder upon the public the further they were removed from the place where the coals were obtained, and thus greatly augmented the difficulty of obtaining a supply of fuel. If there were to be a coal-duty, it ought to be laid on at the mouth of the pit, and thus it would fall equally on all, instead of being, as it was at present, exceedingly partial. There was no tax which should be repealed before the duty on coals. He was of opinion, that one of the evils of the present system of taxation was to be found in the restrictions it imposed on industry, by which employment was limited, both in England and Ireland.

Mr. *Maberly* was of opinion, that the best way of arriving at a right decision on subjects of this kind was, to call for a thorough revision of the Revenue laws, instead of taking up the question abstractedly, on particular points.

Mr. *Patten* observed, that when the proper time arrived he would show that this tax pressed heavily on the agricultural interest. When a farmer had several daughters, it must of necessity be very onerous to him.

Petition laid on the Table.

REPEAL OF THE UNION—IRELAND.] Mr. *Wyse*:—I rise to present five Petitions from various parts of the county of Tipperary, praying for a Repeal of the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland. The first from the inhabitants of the united parishes of Kilsheelan and Kilcash; the second from the inhabitants of the parishes of Fethard and Killusty; the third from the inhabitants of the parish of Temple Michael; the fourth from the parishioners of Ballingarry; and the fifth from the inhabitants of the barony of Eliogarty. The parishioners all ground their several prayers on nearly the same persuasion, of the injuries which have been inflicted by this international treaty: but as I stated on a former night I should abstain from all discussion of the merits or demerits of the question, until it should be brought before the House in a practical and distinct form, I will adhere to this resolution, and not trespass on the time or attention of the House by any *ex-parte* discussion at the present moment. Public opinion should be given its fair operation, and I am quite certain, when the time comes, public opinion will decide as it ought. But I cannot forbear entreating the attention of the House to this marked circumstance—that there is not one of these petitions which does not set out, after professions of attachment to the Sovereign of this country, and an anxiety to preserve unbroken the connexion, by alleging as the principal ground of their complaint, the state of extreme destitution in which the country remains at present. One fourth of the population is out of employment, according to the reports and evidence before this House. Is it to be supposed that so large a mass of the population of any country so fluctuating between the boundaries of life and death, will quietly sit down and starve, with blessings in their mouths on your paternal Legislature, without some effort to do themselves justice, and to wrest from circumstances a chance of better fortunes for themselves and their families. The people of Ireland naturally allege, that there must be mistake, or incapacity, or neglect, somewhere. In one of the petitions, that of the barony of Eliogarty, they do not attribute these results to any indisposition in an English House to attend to Irish interests, but, in a rational spirit, suppose, that distance of place, inadequate knowledge, and shortness of time, prevent, as in their minds they must always prevent, any Legislature, embracing so very many vast objects as this, from attending minutely to their domestic grievances. In a more wholesome state of society this might not be felt, or, if felt, might more easily be endured; but in Ireland, so far behind hand in the race of civilization, a more than ordinary share of attention, a more than usual spirit of kindness, is necessary. It depends upon you to refute, not by loose attacks, or partial denial, or vague promises, these allegations, but by substantial and active justice and energetic measures of remedy; and until the people be employed—until the surplus population be put into activity by capital—until the resources of the country are drawn forth by some positive application of the power of Government—not these complaints only will 'you hear, but thousands like them, from every part of the country. So impressed am I with this conviction, that I had anxiously waited during the whole of this short Session, to see whether either Government, or some of the Representatives of Ireland, would take up this question, and had intended, as no other hon. Member had taken up the matter, to give a notice of motion, having for its view the employment of the working classes in Ireland; but I shall defer my notice to a later period of the evening, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer will be in his place; and I do this because I should prefer having the question taken up by his Majesty's Government, which can most effectually meet the wishes and the wants of the Irish people.

Five Petitions, from places in Kildare and Tipperary, read and laid on the Table.

LINEN TRADE IN IRELAND.] Sir *Robert Bateson* rose to present a Petition, and as it was neither on slavery nor on the repeal of the Union, he hoped to obtain the attention of the House. He regretted much at not seeing any of his Majesty's Ministers present. He recollected that on a late occasion some observations had been made relative to the absence of Ministers at the hour of half-past three. He approved of such observations, as he thought it was important that they should be present while petitions from the country were being presented. The petition came from a person of the name of Alexander Barlow, a linen merchant residing in Dublin. He stated, that the trade in linen was rapidly decreasing, in consequence of the importation into Ireland of cotton-twist, duty free, which caused the linen manufactories in Ireland to decline. Although he was not averse to the principles of free trade, about which some political economists talked so much, he was quite sure that on the present occasion the want of protection, with regard to the importation of cotton-twist, was a cause of very serious distress to Ireland. Previous to the year 1826, there was a protecting duty under the auspices of the Linen Board. He was ready to admit that there might have been jobbing carried on in this Board, but at the same time he was convinced that that Board, and the duty on cotton, which had originated with it, were of some utility to Ireland. This Board had been since abolished, and the consequence was, that the great manufacturers were enabled to make large fortunes, to the loss and detriment of the working classes. He considered that mill spun yarn, and the importation of foreign flax, tended much to the ruin of the trade in Ireland. This had been denied by a certain political economist, but he (Sir R. Bateson) would not give great credence to the opinions of that person, as he had heard him say, that absenteeism was no injury to Ireland, and that it made no difference whether the rents of that country were spent in Ireland or at Constantinople. On the whole, he was quite of opinion that such doctrines as had been advocated by that gentleman, would, if brought into operation, be very ruinous to Ireland. The petition which he had to present was the first of many, which after the recess, would be presented on the same subject. In conclusion, he wished to make one observation. Much had been said in the House against the system of agitation carried on in Ireland; to prevent that, let the House give employment to the poor, and protection to the staple trade of that country.

Mr. *Maberly* thought, that the doctrines urged by the hon. Member would be highly injurious to the country. What! did the hon. Gentleman recommend that a duty should be put on cotton; on the very article which was the principal source of employment to the poor in the country? He rather thought that a bounty should be granted for its importation. The hon. Gentleman had said much about the failure of the linen trade in Ireland. The reason of this, in his opinion, was, that Ireland did not apply that skill of which she was capable to the improvement of her manufactories, and, in consequence, her trade in linen had emigrated to Scotland and Yorkshire. He agreed with the hon. Member, that the system of agitation carried on in Ireland tended much to injure that country. No sooner was one subject over than another was started, and the people were kept from applying themselves to procuring permanent employment.

Sir *R. Bateson* said, unfortunately they had little or no capital in Ireland. If the hon. member for Abingdon would introduce his, the people there would feel most happy.

O'Gorman Mahon said, the hon. Baronet laboured under a strange confusion of ideas, for he had recommended that the two most important subjects, as regarded England and Ireland, namely, the Slave Trade and the Repeal of the Union, should be deferred for less important considerations. It had been truly stated, that the linen trade of Ireland had declined, but that, he thought, was owing to the quantity of absentees. He assured the House that there was no risk in investing capital in Ireland, where it was quite as safe, and indeed safer, than in England. The great evil in that country was want of capital, which, if invested there, would promote industry and prevent agitation. Much had been said by the hon. member for Abingdon about agitation in Ireland, but he must deny that any existed there, if by that term was meant any thing that led to rebellion and insurrection. To be sure, if it was merely meant that people felt warmly when their interests were concerned, there was no occasion to deny that; but in other respects, the whole of Ireland was in a state of the profoundest tranquillity; and he would take upon himself to say, that that tranquillity had emanated from the agitation that had previously existed on the question of religion, and when agitation was called for and necessary. The consequence of what had then been done was, that now the Orangeman and Catholic were daily shaking hands, and feuds on the score of religion had entirely ceased.

Mr. *Alderman Waithman* complained of these discussions upon petitions. He had been attending three or four nights running to present a petition, and had always found, from hon. Gentlemen indulging in such long speeches, that before his turn came, the time allotted by the House for the presentation of petitions had elapsed. He must claim the right, on the part of the people, of having their petitions heard, if he sat there all night.

Mr. *Hume* said, the cause of the decay of the linen trade in Ireland was the restriction under which it laboured, and for this Irish Members were principally to be blamed; for he recollected when, seven years ago, bounties and such restrictions were taken off the linen trade in Scotland, he and other Members, amongst them the hon. Baronet, the member for the Queen's county, predicted that the Scotch linen trade would flourish, and the Irish trade decay, and such turned out to be the fact. It was to the removal of those restrictions that he attributed the start which the Scotch trade had taken, and he was sure the best way would be, to leave that and all other trades and occupations to themselves.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* said, that with respect to what had just dropped from the worthy Alderman, he thought that unless some other arrangement was made, the petitions of the people might as well be at once thrown aside. He had attended five days in his place to present a petition, and though he had always been down at the House by twelve or one o'clock in the day, and set his name down immediately, he had no opportunity of so doing. He therefore trusted that the rule for public business to commence at five o'clock, which was now existing, would undergo some modification and restriction.

The *Speaker* said, it would be well for hon. Gentlemen to bear in mind what really was the rule adopted by the House. The rule was, that he should attend at three o'clock, and that the public business of the day should commence at five o'clock. After the public business was disposed of, however, an opportunity would be afforded to hon. Members to present such petitions as had not been received before five o'clock. He had never failed, after the public business was finished, to go through the remainder of the list in his hands, and the hon. Gentleman's name was one of those called over by him last night.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* said, he had not the least idea that his name would have been called over at half-past one o'clock in the morning.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* had heard the Speaker call over the names, and he (Sir M. W. Ridley) was the only one out of twenty who answered. It was by the inattention of Members, not the want of opportunity, if they were unable to present their petitions.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* said, he was absent on account of illness; and it would be impossible for hon. Members to avoid indisposition, if they were required to attend till a late hour in the morning.

The *Speaker* said, that although the hon. Gentleman might be incapacitated by ill health from attending, he could assure the House that it was possible to bear the fatigue, for if any one was compelled to attend, he was.

Petition laid on the Table.

ALLEGED LIBELLOUS PUBLICATION.] Lord *Palmerston*, seeing the hon. Member for Carmarthen in his place (Mr. R. Trevor), rose to request him to postpone the motion of which he had given notice, respecting an alleged libellous publication, because the noble Lord who represented the Government in that House was unavoidably absent on account of a family misfortune.

Mr. *R. Trevor* expressed his readiness to accede to the request of the noble Lord. The hon. Member was about to state the reasons which induced him to bring forward the question, when he was called to order by

The *Speaker*, who informed the hon. Member that, as he did not intend to persevere in his motion, he could not at that time enter into a discussion on it.

Mr. Trevor postponed it to Thursday.

WEST-INDIA TRADE WITH AMERICA.] Mr. *Poulett Thomson* proposed that the second reading of the Bill on the subject should be postponed until after the recess, on account of the many interests it involved. During the holidays the Government would consider the subject, and see whether any measure could be prepared, better calculated to protect the different parties interested.

Mr. *Herries* had no objection to the postponement, though he was sorry that any delay should take place on so important a question. He could assure the House, however, that the Bill already before it had been fully considered by the Members of the late Government, and that every endeavour had been made to meet the interests of those most concerned in the measure. In the event, therefore, of any new Bill that should be introduced being found objectionable, he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would have the candour to revert to the present one.

Mr. *George Robinson* said, that he had one or two questions to ask, and he would take this opportunity of asking them. From the correspondence between the American Minister and Lord Aberdeen, it appeared, that we had conceded to the United States the principle of a right in those States to a direct intercourse between them and our West-India colonies. Into this most injurious arrangement he would not enter at present, but when the time arrived, he should be able to show irresistibly that to grant such a principle, without equivalent, was most unadvisable. The late President of the Board of Trade had stated, that in so doing the Government had acted on the principles of Mr. Canning and Mr. Huskisson; but he denied that this was the case, and he could positively state, that Mr. Huskisson, shortly before his death, declared, that he never would agree to such an arrangement without an equivalent, and that it was directly contrary to the feelings of Mr. Canning on the subject. He therefore thought that he had a right to complain, for in 1826 Mr. Canning, and afterwards Lord Dudley, had stated that they never would consent to the concession of that principle without some very adequate cause. On the faith of that assertion the merchants of Canada, and our colonies in North America, had embarked their capital on the trade between Canada and the West Indies; but now this very principle was conceded, and their trade would be ruined. He had read the correspondence between Mr. Maclean and the Earl of Aberdeen, and he could see nothing in it but the greatest arrogance on the part of America—first making claims to which she had not the slightest pretence, and then threatening, if they were not conceded. In his opinion, that correspondence was a disgrace to the Administration under which it was carried on. One of the questions which he wished to ask of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. P. Thomson) was, whether the present Government (after the late Government had conceded the principle of a direct intercourse between the United States and our West-India possessions, reserving to themselves the right of regulating their duties, as the Americans were to have the right of regulating theirs) was not aware that Mr. Maclean was re-opening the negotiation, thereby daring—and he used the word advisedly—to interfere with this Government in the regulation of our duties; and the consequence of which would be, that, after the recess, another schedule of duties would be put forward? He also wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman below him (Mr. Herries), whether the late Government had not written to the usual officers at the Canadas, stating what would be the scale of duties, and that his communication was to be considered official? He wished to know positively if the right hon. Gentleman sanctioned the scale of duties which had been sent out to the colonies, and whether official notice of that scale were sent to all the colonies, as that to which the Government was determined to adhere? The hon. Member then censured in strong terms the conduct of the late Government, which, he said, had tended to confer great advantages on the inhabitants of the United States. Our Ministers had been completely outdone by the superior diplomatic skill of Mr. Maclean, who had shown himself far better informed than our negociators in all that concerned the interests of our colonies, as well as in all that concerned the interests of the United States. If there were any power of which we ought to be jealous it was the United States. She already almost equalled this great maritime country in the extent of her shipping; and while the measure under discussion would tend to dry up one source, and the principal source of our national wealth—he meant our shipping, it would add 200,000 tons to the shipping of the United States. The hon. Member concluded by requesting the Government to inform him if it was now carrying on negotiations with Mr. Maclean relative to this subject, and he requested his right hon. friend below (Mr. Herries) to answer the question he had put to him.

Sir *H. Parnell* advised his right hon. friend opposite (Mr. Poulett Thomson) not to answer the question of the hon. Member, for it was plainly not the duty of Government to give him any information concerning an existing negotiation, which might materially injure its progress. With respect to the Bill brought in by the right hon. Gentleman the member for Harwich (Mr. Herries), he must say, that it was a direct violation of the Treaty we had concluded with the United States. There could be no doubt that negotiations were going on, for the American Minister would not fulfil his duty if he were not to endeavour to stop the progress of the measure. That negotiation must, however, lead to a new transaction. His right hon. friend could not adopt the principle of the bill proposed by the right hon. member for Harwich. Before that bill could pass, if the Government meant to pass it, he would call for a copy of the correspondence between Mr. Maclean and his Majesty's Government. The principle of the bill brought in by the right hon. member for Harwich, was the old principle of protection for our colonies and prohibition for other people. He for one would earnestly caution the House how it again adopted that now exploded and fallacious doctrine.

Mr. *Herries* rose to answer the question put to him by the hon. Member, and appealed to the House whether the observations made by his hon. friend, and the reference to the subject under discussion, had been fair and open. The question before the House was, whether or not the bill should be postponed; and on that occasion he would not, nor was it fair to discuss the principles of the measure. He regretted that, having already spoken, he was unable to answer the observations of the hon. Member, who attacked the late Government, which were as capable of being answered as the remarks of his hon. friend. He had never heard statements more susceptible of being answered, he had never heard assertions made, more contrary to truth, nor had he ever heard greater mistakes than had been then made and committed. If he were not prevented by the forms of the House, he would expose the fallacy of these assertions by one single circumstance, and he regretted that he was unable to do so. He denied positively, that Mr. Canning had said that he would never open the trade of the colonies to the Americans. He had always stated, that if the American government would withdraw its regulations of 1821 and 1823, he would then consider of opening that trade. As to what his hon. friend (Sir H. Parnell) said, he must observe, that to declare, during a pending negotiation, that our Government was entirely in the wrong, was itself highly wrong; nothing could be more injurious. He should be ready to demonstrate, on any proper occasion, that the Americans were altogether wrong, and the English Government altogether right. In fact, the Americans had not a shadow of a right for their claims. The question was, whether we had a right to regulate the transfer trade of our own colonies in relation to a foreign State. Any Minister who should say, that we had not such a right, and power to do so, would not be worthy of holding office for a moment. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by apologizing for saying so much, and begging the House not to draw any conclusion unfavourable to his views, for not having said more, as, having spoken, he was not at liberty to answer the observations of the two hon. Members. With respect to the scale of duties mentioned by the hon. Member, he must say, that no official information could have been given to the colonies that such would be the scale of duties, because that had to be settled by the Parliament, and could not be settled by the Government. At the same time the persons connected with the colonies, who had access to the public offices, and must have such access, had certainly reason to believe, that such a scale would be adopted, and they had probably sent such information to the colonies.

Mr. *Hume* deprecated the language used by the hon. Member (Mr. Robinson) as to America, and condemned the bill as contrary to the interest of the United States and our own West-India colonies. It increased the price of commodities in the West-Indies from fifty to 100 per cent, and rendered production there dearer in that proportion. He should always oppose the bill.

Mr. *John Stewart* hoped, that when the bill was again brought forward, the question would be discussed in conjunction with the general question, and not on any partial grounds.

Mr. *Poulett Thomson* declined to answer the question of the hon. Member, and lamented that he should have indulged in such language against America. If that Power had injured us, redress could better be obtained by calm remonstrance than angry expressions.

The second reading of the Bill postponed till February 11th.

CARRICKFERGUS ELECTION.] Sir *R. Inglis* moved, that a petition he had presented to the House yesterday evening, from Lord George Hill, stating that some of the names signed to the petition from Carrickfergus, complaining of his return, had been forged, be referred to a Committee. This was an important subject, involving the privileges of the House, which was quite sufficient ground on which to rest his Motion. He might assert the fact which constituted the offence on the authority of the noble Lord the sitting member for Carrickfergus, and he did not suppose, that the House could object to the Motion.

Viscount *Palmerston* had some doubts as to the propriety of the course recommended, but would leave the matter to the decision of the House.

Mr. *Hume* thought the statements of the forgery ought to be first verified on oath, as had been done in other cases.

Sir *A. Chichester* opposed the Motion, and stated, that the petition complained of was an election petition, complaining of the noble Lord's return, and accusing him of corrupt practices. It was a genuine petition, and not a fraud, as alleged by the hon. Baronet.

Sir *James Graham* was of opinion, as it touched the privileges of the House, that the Motion should be granted.

Sir *A. Chichester* bore testimony to the character of some of the petitioners, and denied that the statements against them were substantiated.

Motion agreed to, and Committee appointed forthwith, to report on the petition to the House.

STATE OF THE LABOURING CLASSES—SPADE HUSBANDRY.] Mr. *Curteis* had several petitions to present from different parishes in Sussex, complaining of the weight of taxation, and of the tithe-system. To one of them, from the inhabitants of Horsham, he wished to draw the attention of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, the case of the petitioners being very hard. One of them had informed him, that previous to the late turn-out of the labourers, there was none in his parish unemployed, or who received less than 12*s.* a week, while many received a great deal more. This petition prayed that the tithe-system might be altered, and gave a plan for that purpose; and he should therefore ask to have it printed. The other petitions were chiefly from those interested in agriculture, and the agricultural interest throughout the country was in the deepest distress. He wished to draw the attention of the noble Lord interested in the bill for bettering the condition of the labouring poor, to a statement he had to make respecting the wages received by the labourers in a certain parish in Sussex. A few days ago, a gentleman, having the largest estate in a large parish of Sussex, gave him an exact account of the wages he paid to his labourers last year; which confirmed the opinion, that where they get employment they are well paid; that, generally, it is only the poverty of the farmers and landowners which prevents them from employing more hands, and where they do employ additional hands, it may happen that all have not sufficient. It would be as wrong for him to impute the disorganized state of the country to the Government having refused to go into an examination of the distress of last year, as it would be in the Government to attribute the distress to fair and adequate wages not being given to the labourers. The gentleman he had already alluded to, and he would mention the fact to shew that wages had not been raised by the late disturbances, informed him that none of his old labourers, single or married, received less than 12*s.* a week, and that he paid more to those who behaved well. The average rate of wages in the parish was not less than 1*s.* 8*d.* a day. To his carter he gave 16*s.* a week; to his second carter he gave 13*s.* a week; and to other superior men he gave 15*s.* and 18*s.* a week. This information was derived from a gentleman who went into all the minutiæ of farming, and was, therefore, perfectly competent to explain these details. In the adjoining parish, no farmer whatever paid his labourers last winter less than 2*s.* a day. In the parish in which he (Mr. Curteis) had resided for the last two winters, wages had not been less than 2*s.* a day; which he paid himself, although it was wrongly reported the other day, that he paid his labourers only 1*s.* 9*d.* Yesterday he saw another gentleman, from a parish in Sussex, who told him that he knew but of one instance where wages were less than 2*s.* a day. Indeed he said that more persons paid above 2*s.* than less. He would again urge upon the Government, that it was the poverty of the farmer, and nothing else, which caused the distress of the labouring classes. The agriculturists of this country were not so selfish as to act unjustly towards the labourers they employed. That being the only opportunity he should have before the recess, he would embrace it to say, that he highly approved of the sentiments uttered the other night by the noble Earl at the head of the Government, particularly in so far as they related to the agriculturist. That statement would be received with pleasure throughout the country. At the same time he was bound to say, that he heard with some degree of jealousy and alarm what fell from a noble Lord, then absent. He stated, that he had some inclination to agree with those who were in favour of free-trade. He wished to tell that noble Lord, whom the country had hitherto looked up to as a true friend of the agricultural interest, that if he favoured the doctrines of the political economist, so far as to advocate the introduction of foreign corn free of duty, he would bring destruction on all the interests of this nation. Nothing would tend so much to the ruin of the manufacturing and commercial interests, as the introduction of foreign corn free of duty. He did not stand up to advocate any particular system of Corn-laws, but the English agriculturists must, should, and would have protection, though he cared not in what way. He had received a statement from the parish of Burridge, in Sussex, which was most appalling. There are 7,000 acres of land in the parish; the tithes amount to 700*l.*, the highway-rate to 700*l.*, and other charges in proportion. How was it possible, he would ask, that the agricultural interest could contend against such taxes and claims as these? Yet would the political economists, in their wisdom, advocate the introduction of corn free of duty. To act on their principles would be perfect insanity. The agriculturists were not the selfish people they were supposed to be, and let them be freed from taxes and duties, and they would undertake to compete with the foreigner. Then he would agree that it might be advisable to have a perfectly free trade in corn; but till then, he hoped the Government would not yield to any of their former friends, or, if there be any in the Administration, to any of the political economists, they are associated with. The hon. Member concluded by presenting the several petitions to which he alluded at the beginning of his speech.

Mr. *Briscoe* wished to claim the attention of the House for a single minute, what he had to say being in reference to the distress of the labouring classes; and as he thought he could suggest a practical mode for administering relief to them, it was his duty not to hesitate to trespass on the House. He wished to allow labourers to occupy portions of land not exceeding an acre, by which they might be able to raise a subsistence for the maintenance of their own families. He had received visits from farmers, and from persons who had devoted their time to the welfare of the country, and they one and all assured him that in no instance where the experiment had been made, had it been known to fail. For his own part, he had been in the habit of directing considerable attention to the welfare of the poor, and he did not think, that at the present moment there was any other mode whatever by which relief could be afforded to them, and by which the burthens which bore so heavily on the farmer, and consequently on the landlord, could be mitigated. In the county which he had the honour to represent, there existed this extraordinary phenomenon, for such he could not help considering it;—there was a parish with between 4,000 and 5,000 acres of uncultivated land, and applications were daily made to the overseers for work. There were many families quite unemployed, and although all the inhabitants of that parish, with one exception, and that exception an absentee proprietor, concurred in the propriety of enclosing only twenty acres, which would immediately furnish employment to those persons, such was the state of the law, that the parish could not turn that waste land into account. When the pressure of distress was so severely felt by all classes, not merely by the rich, but by those only one degree above the poor themselves, it was strange, that a thing so obvious to common sense as the apportionment of a part of this uncultivated land to the poor, which they were willing to receive in lieu of what they now had from the rates, should not be acted upon, and still stranger was it that the prohibition to acting on that common sense view, arose from the law. A practical farmer lately meeting a labourer, not far from Lord Winchilsea's property, he inquired into his circumstances, and found that he had a wife and eight children, that his wages were 12*s.* a week, that he had a cottage, for which he gave 2*s.* a week, but that having no garden to it, he was obliged to get 5*s.* a week from the parish. The gentleman asked him whether he would forego the parish allowance if he were permitted to take one or two acres of land, paying rent for it in the same way as the farmers round about. He answered that he only wished he could get the land, for by that means he should be able to give employment to his family, and to bring them up in habits of prudence and industry. The produce of one acre under spade-husbandry was equal to three acres cultivated in the ordinary way, so that there could be no doubt of the benefit to the party taking land to cultivate by the spade, and to the parish there would be a saving in that individual instance of 13*l.* a year. If, upon further consideration, it should seem desirable, that the subject should be brought before the House, he should probably, after the recess, ask permission to bring in a bill to enable parishes to give their waste land to the poor, and perhaps also to grant them small loans to obtain seed to cultivate the land.

Mr. *Long Wellesley* was satisfied, that the country and the House would receive the opinions just delivered, with the greatest possible respect. This question was one of the greatest and most important which the Government could take into consideration. Of all the questions that concerned the internal welfare of this country, there were none so important as those which the two hon. Members had raised; and of all the branches of those questions, there were none more important than those which they had in part discussed. The hon. member for Sussex spoke of the Corn-laws, and of the importation of foreign corn; the other hon. Member had stated, that spade-husbandry alone could relieve the labouring classes, or at least he meant to make spade-husbandry a primary object. Those questions had occupied the attention of some of the most celebrated men in the kingdom, who had written on the subject of political economy, and the state of the poor, and could not be supposed, therefore, to be questions easily settled. For his part, he agreed with the hon. member for Surrey, that the adoption of spade-husbandry would be exceedingly valuable; and he regretted, that he had not a letter in his pocket, which he had received from Essex, in which the advantages of that system were set forth. That letter stated, that a system of spade-husbandry had been adopted near Tilbury Fort in Essex, and effectually stopped a disposition to insubordination, —an adequate price being at the same time paid for the land. The people were before this in a state of insurrection. In consequence, however, of the suggestion having been made to him, and of his acceding to it, small portions of land had been let, at a low rent, to 600 or 700 people. The hon. Member, however, must not forget the extreme difficulties of the question, that this parish was singularly situated, and that the plan might not, therefore, be equally advantageous elsewhere. If he were not afraid to occupy the attention of the House too long, he could shew how a measure he was about to bring forward, concerning the clergy, would promote the same object; but that would open too wide a field. In the parish he spoke of, the population was in the proportion of eight persons to every 100 acres of land; and the hon. member for Surrey, who was well acquainted with agricultural matters, must know, that when there existed so great a superabundant population, it would be impossible to provide for them by spade-husbandry, unless we could do away with our old system of agriculture—a question perhaps not unworthy of consideration. He thought our present system of agriculture a bad one; for he had lived in countries where it was impossible not to see the advantages of a different system. He alluded particularly to the Florentine States, which, although one of the least communities of Europe, is, by its system of husbandry, made one of the most happy and prosperous. The House must, however, take care not to adopt an important principle of information without due consideration, which might plunge into distress a valuable portion of the community. The other night a Gentleman brought forward a measure affecting the settlement of the poor. As a country gentleman and as a Magistrate, he knew that that was a question of vast importance. The House was quite empty; the question was nearly decided; but the words, "settlement of the poor," having caught his ear, he took the liberty of rising, and suggesting, that it should be postponed to a more fit opportunity. He would suggest, however, to the two hon. Members, although they had entered into these questions incidentally, that no man had ability and capacity of mind sufficient to settle such important subjects as these were become; they raised questions which interested the welfare of the whole community, and required all the talents of the country to adjust them. On the subject of the Poor-laws, he wished to say, that their principle was excellent, and their mal-administration the cause of all the evil of which the people complained.

Sir *John Sebright* wished, that he could think, with the hon. member for Surrey, that the plan he alluded to would be beneficial, because it could be easily applied; but he was convinced, from his own experience, as well as that of others, that the benefits to the poor from such a plan would not answer expectation. Some years ago, he observed some cottages in his parish, not belonging to him, which had no gardens; whilst all his cottages had. He laid out a piece of land, and divided it into gardens for those cottages, letting each garden at the nominal rent of 6*d.*; in allotting these pieces of ground, he consulted some respectable labouring men, of sense and experience in such matters, who had been in his service twenty or thirty years, as to the size they should be of. The precise extent he did not recollect, but by their advice they were made excessively small, large enough, they said, for a man following his daily occupations to cultivate. He thought they were too small, and probably, if the thing were to be done over again, he should make them larger. He agreed with the hon. member for Surrey, that a garden to a poor man was not only good from the profit it yielded him, but for the employment it found for his wife and children, and also for himself in his leisure hours; but he did not believe, except in particular situations, and under peculiar circumstances, that it could answer for any labourer to hold more ground than he could cultivate as a kitchen garden, Taking the average of land in Hertfordshire at 20*s.* an acre, a man by cultivating that land by the spade, could not get 6*d.* a-day from it. He had no objection to try the experiment, and he had land in Staffordshire, and other parts of England, from which he was willing to give up a part, rent-free, for the purpose of trying the experiment, but he was convinced it would not answer. He once had an argument on this subject with a foreigner, a friend of his, who was staying at his house, and to settle it, he took the opinion of some of the most intelligent men in his neighbourhood. One of them was a gardener, who had been thirty years in his service; a very sensible man. He asked them whether they would take any quantity of land, naming it themselves, rent-free, to gain a livelihood for their family by spade-husbandry; and they, one and all, knowing thoroughly the nature of the subject, and being intelligent labouring men, declared that they would not. There was, perhaps, some land which might be the better for spade-husbandry, but there was some which would not be improved by it; but he would not enter into that theoretical question, his only intention being, to express his opinion that, unless under very peculiar circumstances, a labourer could not be benefitted by holding more land than he could convert into the purposes of a kitchen garden; and if there were any country gentlemen in the House who thought otherwise, he called upon them to give some land for that purpose. He could only say, for his own part, that he was willing to give every one of his labourers, or any labourer on the parish, sufficient to carry the plan into effect; nor would this be such matter of great liberality; for, looking at the thing closely, the landowners would save in poor-rates what they might lose in rent. "Why," it was said, "not give the labourers two acres a piece?" Why, for this reason—that they could not make use of it; but, although he did not think it would succeed, he was ready to try the experiment.

Lord *Nugent* said, that a system of the sort under discussion, in the course of the last two years, had fallen under his observation, and the result of that experience was favourable. It might, however, be one of those particular cases which the hon. Baronet spoke of, and certainly, in that part of the country the land was very good. Small portions of land had been let at exceedingly high rents, indeed so high, that no landlord could in conscience have demanded, or in practice have had a chance of obtaining from a farmer, namely, at the rate of 3*l.* an acre, the tenant paying the rates. For a rood, 15*s.* was paid to the landlord, and 2*s.* to the poor-rates, and its produce was at least 5*l.* The crop was generally potatoes; and taking the produce at 100 bushels, producing one with another 1*s.* a bushel, the result would give a crop valued at 5*l.* The plan had this advantage, that besides encouraging the labourers to cultivate this rood with the utmost care and economy, it enabled them to bring a new capital of labour into action; for when a garden was brought into a friable state by good culture, it might be kept in that state by two children of from twelve to fourteen years of age, whose labour was thus made profitable, without being brought into the general labour-market. If there were a glut of labour in the parish, a labourer that found his wages too low, would withdraw his portion from the market, and sell himself, as it were, two or three days' labour, for the cultivation of his own garden. Upon this experience he certainly could bear his testimony to the great advantage of spade-husbandry, even where the allotments of ground were at high rents, and placed under careful restrictions.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* thought, the hon. Member had entered upon the discussion of questions which must be left to the landlords themselves. He did not pretend to have much experience in these matters, but he knew that if a cottager was not to be a thief, he should have a good-sized garden; for it was too much to expect that he should see his family want; and when once he had broken through the law, there was no saying at what he would stop. Some persons called out down with the rents, and if the House wanted a revolution, be it so, but the country was not in such a condition, that one class of the community could be relieved at the expense of another. He had a petition in his hands, which he should not then present, from a number of the inhabitants of London, at the head of whom was an Alderman, once in this House, complaining of great distress. They state, that their trade and profits are diminished, and that their property is annihilated. He could well believe the statement, for cases came before him as a Magistrate, which fully confirmed it. In one of the London parishes, above sixty householders were lately summoned for non-payment of their rates. A poor woman, the wife of one of them, went to him in tears, and told him, that she had been threatened with a warrant, to compel her to pay the poor-rates. He found upon inquiry, that her husband had been twenty-seven years in the army, but had for some years past set up in a little way of business, and was then unable to go abroad, because he had pawned his hat and coat, to make up a sum to pay the assessed taxes of which the petition he had referred to prayed the repeal: she brought the tax-gatherer's receipt, with a list of all her duplicates. They had begun with pawning little articles of luxury, such as a ring or two; then came coats, shirts, bed, and, finally, bed-covering, and the last article pawned was for 6*d*. They had submitted to the last extremity rather than go to the poor-house, and wanted only to be excused the poor-rates to make one effort more. The agriculturists could not be relieved at the expense of the trading classes. If the distress were confined to one particular district, the remedy of the hon. member for Surrey, or of the hon. member for Hertfordshire, might, perhaps, be beneficially applied; but the Parliament could not cure the existing grievances by any such means. To talk of putting down rents was sufficient to excite the poorer classes against their landlords. What right had the House to interfere with rents? for men make their own bargains. The farmer had his land too cheap at the beginning of the war, and by the rise of prices, the agricultural interest prospered; since then, we had been retracing our steps, and labourer, farmer, and landlord, had successively felt the effects of it. Rents had come down, and must come down, simply because the farmers could not afford to pay them. In London all leasehold property had been destroyed, some which was of equal value to freehold. In Cheapside, some of the houses, the leases of which cost thousands, could hardly be kept up by dividing them into three or four little shops. The ground-landlord alone in London maintained his station, and he could name persons in the City who received 30,000*l*. or 40,000*l*. a year for ground-rents. Bricklayers, carpenters, painters, and all concerned in the building of houses had been ruined, whilst the ground-landlord had still the same rent, and every article he consumed might be had at a cheaper rate. They were told, forsooth, that they ought to send more manufactured goods abroad. In fact, the country did that, and sent 150 instead of 100 pieces of cloth, but got no profit. His conviction was, that the Legislature must either raise prices, or bring down taxation. His hon. friend, the member for Middlesex, must not imagine that he is the only individual anxious to reduce the taxes, for he was desirous of going as far as any man in all practicable reductions. Some of the great pensions must be swept away, if the House wished to avoid those convulsions and revolutions, which must necessarily follow perseverance in extravagance. The country would infallibly be ruined, if the Parliament had not the wisdom, firmness, and honesty, to meet the necessities of the times. When Gentlemen discussed questions about the distress, however disorderly it might be to depart from the particular subject under discussion, entering upon various topics was unavoidable. He rose principally to deprecate this system of debate, deeming it better to have a distinct discussion brought on by a regular notice. The House had been told, that it ought to wait for a general examination of the taxes, and not ask for reductions on particular items; but in that he could not agree, for the House ought immediately to reduce those taxes which affect the middle classes, for if they were in a state of prosperity the lower classes need not fear want of employment. Some persons talked everlastingly about the necessity of importing foreign corn, because they said foreigners would not otherwise take our manufactured goods. But in the last year we imported 3,500,000*l*. worth of corn, while foreigners had taken 1,000,000*l*. less of our goods; so that there was scarcely a position in political economy which experience did not contradict. On the 15th February next, he meant to lay upon the Table a string of Resolutions, being a mere statement of facts, to shew the nature, extent, and particular periods of the great depreciations in the value of our trade and manufactures.

The petition read.

Mr. *Curteis*, on moving that the petition be printed, begged to thank hon. Members who had given him their advice, and particularly the hon. Alderman, for his lesson about bringing this subject forward. He could only say, that he was inclined to obey his constituents, from seeing so many false representations going forth as to the inclinations of the agricultural interests. He bowed with deference to the House, but he was bound to say, with perfect courtesy, that the hon. Alderman was not one of those persons who would stop his mouth when expressing the sentiments of his constituents.—Petition to be printed. The hon. Member also presented petitions from the Rector, Curate, Parish Officers, and Inhabitants of Iden, Playden, and Guldeford, for the repeal of the Malt-tax.

Mr. *Slaney* knew full well that there were many places in Sussex in which wages were extremely low. He did not say this as a matter of blame to the individuals employing labourers in those parishes, for it was shewn before the committee over which he had the honour to be placed, that the lowness of wages arose from there being in some parishes a greater number of labourers than could be employed at an adequate remuneration, and from the poor-laws having being wrested from their original intention, and administered in a manner so different from what they were in the north of England. He hoped that those who had the management of the poor would retrace their steps, for till that were done, it would be impossible that the peasantry could be placed in a comfortable condition.

Mr. *Warburton* observed, that the hon. member for Sussex had said, that the agricultural interest must, should, and would have protection. Had the House ever heard the commercial or manufacturing interest declare that they must, should, and would have protection? Was that proper language for any hon. Member to use? Was not the House to consider every measure calmly and deliberately, with a view to the public good; and was the public good to be sacrificed to the violence of the agriculturists?

Colonel *Sibthorp* could not understand why the hon. Member should remonstrate because it had been said, that the agriculturist must, should, and would have protection. He joined with the hon. member for Sussex in that declaration, and thought that he was entitled to the thanks of his constituents for making it. He hoped that the agriculturists might yet be allowed to demand and receive protection.

Mr. *Tennyson* was sure, that the hon. member for Sussex would retract the expression in the sense put upon it by the hon. member for Bridport. In the present distracted state of the country, and especially of the agricultural interest, the use of such language might have the most injurious consequences. There was quite enough excitement out of doors already, without having a seeming sanction given to it by Gentlemen in that House.

Mr. *Ruthven* thought the language of the hon. member for Sussex such as he had no reason to be ashamed of, and such as would excite the grateful feelings of his constituents. He went further than the hon. Member, for he said, that the agricultural and manufacturing interests, both must, should, and would have protection, for language of that kind the people had a right to address to their Representatives, and their Representatives to address to the House. He was glad, therefore, that the hon. member for Sussex had spoken in so bold, manly, and firm a tone. With regard to the Corn-laws, he must say, that the averages, which form their distinguishing feature, are most injudicious and inconvenient. The agricultural interest had a right to fair protection, but that would be best afforded by a regular equal duty, not liable to be altered by the machinations of the corn-market. There was no doubt that the alteration in the currency had had a great influence on the present condition of the country, and if means were not taken to enable the industrious classes to pay the taxes, the taxes must be reduced. He agreed in what had been said respecting the necessity of doing away with the great sinecures and extravagant exactions that were made to support them. The Returns of such matters, including pensions, on the Table, were very defective, and the omissions ought to be supplied. When the people saw noblemen putting, as appeared by that list, 15,000*l.* a year into their pockets, they thought, with justice, that it was full time inquiry should be made what they had done to earn so much. The really efficient public officers ought to be liberally and generously paid, as became a great nation, but all sinecures, not granted for public service, he would have cut down without listening to the cry about vested interests. Vested interests, indeed! the vested interests of the people had been shamefully encroached upon; they had been plundered by the creation of sinecure places. He meant to include among them the chief clerkship of the Court of King's Bench, held by a nobleman of the land, who, by being clerk to a Court, put 10,000*l.* a-year into his pocket. What was that for? He desired to see the dignity and splendor of the aristocracy maintained, but not at the expense of the hard-earned money of the people. If that nobleman had done this country any service, or was doing it any service, he would make no objection; but he put this sum into his pocket, and employed a clerk to do his duty. There was also the hon. member for Edinburgh—that he was not in the House was no fault of his (Mr. Ruthven's).

Sir *Robert Inglis* rose to Order. He put it to the Speaker whether the motion before the House admitted such a debate.

The *Speaker* said, when a petition was on the Table, complaining of distress, it was very difficult to say what hon. Members should not speak of, as occasioning that distress. He could not, therefore, support the hon. Baronet in rising to order.

Mr. *Ruthven* in continuation. He would attend with deference to the suggestion of any Member of that House, and to the decision of the Chair, with the greatest respect and gratitude. At the same time he must say, as he was not touching upon any thing relating to the Church, or Jewish Emancipation, that he did not expect that the hon. Baronet at least would have held him to be out of order. If it could be said that sinecure places did not affect the distress of the people, he was indeed out of order. He was speaking of the hon. member for Edinburgh, who complained the other night, that rumours were abroad of his receiving 7,000*l.* a year from the country, whereas it was only 5,000*l.* a year, and of that he had had the great misfortune to lose 400*l.* on one occasion, and 300*l.* on another, by the negligence of clerks. He had not much to complain of; but the Representatives of the people had a right to complain of his receiving such a sum. To honourable and distinguished men, who had served their country, he grudged not the rewards they enjoyed, but he did grudge those sinecure pensions to men who had never served their country, and who, most probably, never would do anything to serve it. He felt that a great deal was due to the public on this account; but he hoped that all hon. Members who agreed with him on this subject, would have a little patience, and not annoy Ministers till they had had time to bring forward their measures of retrenchment, for which he was disposed to give them every credit.

Lord *Nugent* observed, that there were few subjects on which so much time was mis-spent as in deprecating further discussion. When hon. Gentlemen, one after another, deprecated discussion, there was a reasonable ground to be alarmed at the probable length to which it would run. On the presentation of these petitions the House had discussed, at length, the principles of free-trade, the benefits of spade-husbandry, the Poor-laws, and, at length, the abuses of sinecure pensions; while the petition, on which all those questions had been raised, related to the abolition of the duties on malt. He should not have risen, had not the hon. member for Lincoln, and the hon. Member who last spoke, not much in the spirit or feeling of the hon. member for Sussex, got up to reiterate, confirm, and proclaim a phrase that hastily escaped from him, with reference to what he conceived to be the claims of the agriculturist. What the hon. member for Sussex said, unguardedly, they had deliberately proclaimed and enforced. He wished those hon. Gentlemen to consider to what practical, useful end, such language could contribute,—to what could it tend, but to excite the poorer classes? Were there no other interests vested in land besides those of the landowners? was the occupier of the soil, and was the labourer not to be considered? God forbid that we should ever see the time when the peasantry should be encouraged to say, that they must and would have protection! That sort of language had tended to excite the present disturbances; and he must on all occasions deprecate its use in the strongest manner.

Mr. *W. Duncombe* also deprecated the use of any language in the House calculated to excite the labouring population, and especially the agricultural labouring population, in these times of difficulty; but he had no hesitation in stating, that the construction put upon the words of the hon. member for Sussex was perfectly unwarrantable. The hon. Member, in presenting a petition from his constituents, in the ardour of his feelings for their welfare and best interests, stated to the House that, in his opinion, the landed interest must and would be protected. What was the fair parliamentary construction of that phrase? In his mind, and he believed, in every candid and dispassionate mind, it was, that, in the opinion of the hon. Member, it was necessary for the safety of the country, for its best interests, that the agriculturist should be protected; meaning by the landed interest, not the landlord, alone, but the peasantry, and all depending on the cultivation of the soil. That was his conviction of the true construction of the words of the hon. member for Sussex; and he repeated, that they had been misconstrued in a manner which their plain common sense meaning did not warrant. The hon. member for St. Ives commenced by saying, that he deprecated the introduction of the subject of spade-husbandry into discussion; but he concluded by saying, that he yielded to no man in his conviction of its advantages, especially as he had seen them in foreign countries. Further, Sir, the hon. Member said, "that these were subjects of great and extreme importance; that the subject of the Corn-laws was of extreme importance, but," said he, "they are not subjects to be taken up in this way, but are for the consideration and settlement of the executive Government alone." [Mr. *Long Wellesley* denied that he meant or said, that the House was not to discuss such questions.] He thought discussions of that nature, in the present times, most interesting and important to the country; and he could not concur with the hon. member for Blechingly, and others, who blamed and remonstrated with the hon. member for Sussex for the use of such words.

Mr. *Saville Lumley* said, it would be with regret that he should see the expressions of the hon. member for Sussex go forth to the public unretracted, as at the present moment they might produce effects much to be lamented. He did not mean to follow the hon. member for London through all the topics of his speech, but he seemed to consider the principal cause of the distresses of the country was low prices. But he begged to say, in contradiction to that, that it was his firm persuasion, that one of the principal causes of that distress was the high price of the necessaries of life.

Mr. *Courtenay* thought, that the hon. member for Sussex attached no improper meaning to the words he used; but he would suggest to him, that his best course would be, to explain distinctly to the House the measures he proposed for the protection of the landed interest. [Mr. *Curteis.*—Not to night.] He trusted, at any rate, that the hon. Member would not continue to deal in generals, but bring something specific forward for the benefit of the agricultural interest. The same advice might be tendered to the worthy Alderman with respect to the manufacturers, and to the hon. speaker opposite, who spoke of sinecures. There was not a man on the list to which he had alluded, who did not wish to have it fully discussed; and he trusted that any Gentleman who thought that any pension was too large would make a specific motion on the point, and not mislead the public by speaking in general terms. The hon. Member acknowledged that he would be out of order, if the people did not suffer from the two particular sinecures to which he was then alluding. Now, it so happened, that those sinecures were not paid by the people, but by the suitors of the Court, and to strike them off would not reduce the taxes of the country.

Petitions read.

Mr. *Curteis* said,—in moving that they lie upon the Table, he should not attempt to answer separately all the Gentlemen who had addressed him; but he begged to be understood as not having stated anything with respect to labourers in Sussex, that was not correct. There was no doubt great distress in different parts of the country; and many farmers paid lower wages than those he had stated; so that both the hon. member for Shrewsbury (Mr. Slaney) and he might be correct. With regard to what was said by the hon. member for Bridport (Mr. Warburton), he begged to state, most distinctly, to all present, that he did not think that any one could imagine that he was countenancing anything like an appeal to force, or anything but fair petition and just argument. With reference to the words must, should, and would, his opinion was, that the agricultural interest must be attended to, or the country would be ruined; that it should be attended to, would depend upon the exertions of the representatives of the agriculturists in that House; and that it would be attended to, if the House yielded its attention to a just cause.

The Petitions laid on the Table.

TAXATION AND TITHES.] Mr. *Hume* presented two Petitions from the county of Sussex, so entirely different from that presented by the hon. member for that county, that he felt himself obliged to state the nature of them at some length. The first was from Horsham, and had been in his possession for a considerable time. The hon. member for Sussex stated, that the wages paid to labourers in the part of the county in which he resided, were adequate to 16*s*. or 18*s*. a week; but these petitioners stated that they had observed with pain, during a series of years, the gradual reduction of wages, the necessity of the times having compelled the farmer, step by step, to diminish the rate of wages, the consequence of which was, that the condition of the labourer had been materially deteriorated. The petitioners, a respectable class of persons, added that they had witnessed with much grief the gradual impoverishment of the lower classes, who, notwithstanding the heavy pressure of distress for a long period, bore their sufferings without complaint. They added also that the time had now arrived when their distresses and their sufferings could be no longer borne. They went on to state, that the peasantry of the neighbourhood, unable longer to bear their grievances, surrounded the town of Horsham in large bodies, and could not be induced to separate or to return peaceably to their homes, until their employers had agreed to give them an advance of wages. All that this body of the peasantry required was, that their wages should be raised to the rate of 2*s*. a day, which was a pretty decisive answer to the statement of the hon. member for Sussex, that the wages of the agricultural labouring classes in that county amounted to 16*s*. or 18*s*. a week. He could but deplore, that outrages should have been committed, since he was satisfied that the working classes must ultimately be injured by them. The petitioners further stated, that they should be unable to pay the advanced rate of wages which the violence of their labourers had extorted from them, unless they were themselves relieved. They said, that the country required to be relieved from the enormous amount of taxation under which it laboured, and especially that the taxes should be removed from malt, hops, soap, candles, and coals. They hoped, that a practical and constitutional reform of Parliament would take place, believing that no great good could result to the country, and no material improvement take place, until such a reform should be made. They expressed a hope that some appropriation might be made of such parts of the Church property as were not absolutely necessary for the proper support and maintenance of the clergy. They also called upon the House to abolish all useless salaries and unmerited pensions, and to carry retrenchment to the furthest possible extent. That was the substance of the prayer of the petitioners of Horsham. He would proceed to notice another petition, from Selsea, in the same county. signed by every individual of the parish, with the exception of the Rector and six or seven half-pay officers. The latter, of course, deriving their incomes from the Government, did not altogether like to attach their names to a petition of this kind. The reason which induced the worthy Rector to abstain from doing so was a very sufficient one; he was in possession of a very good Living. These petitioners also stated, that they had viewed with great pain the wretchedness and misery to which the labouring poor had been gradually reduced; and they expressed an earnest hope that the House would take into its consideration the subject with a view to devising some measure of relief. They stated, that in their opinion that would be best afforded by a reduction of taxation, and by such a reform of Parliament that every Member sent to the House should be the real representative of the people; for which purpose they were confident that the vote by ballot would be absolutely necessary, in order to protect the poor against the influence of the rich. He was convinced that the statements contained in these petitions were perfectly correct; and could not but think that the high rate of wages mentioned by the hon. member for Sussex, must be limited to a very few parishes. He was sorry that the hon. Member had left the House, because the explanation which he gave was not such an explanation as the occasion required. When he heard one class of the community talking of protection to themselves, and that protection of such a nature as must necessarily operate to deprive others of sharing equally in the necessaries and comforts of life—when he heard from an hon. Member in his place, that that particular class should, would, and must have protection, it was incumbent upon the House to call upon him to explain what he meant, Was it to deprive other classes of that fair protection to which they were justly entitled? Was it to uphold one class at the expense of all others? Was it by giving a monopoly to one to entail distress upon the rest? Was such a line of conduct deserving approbation? Was the language used by the hon. Gentleman not unworthy of a Member of that House? In this point he entirely concurred in the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Nottingham (Mr. Lumley) whose observations were worthy the attention of every Member. The allegation of the hon. member for Sussex, that the landed interest ought to have protection, or in other words, that Parliament should afford to them the means of keeping up the price of food, could never be assented to by the House; and he must deprecate in the strongest manner the language used by the hon. Member. He said, that the time would never come when the trade in corn could be free, but the time was fast coming, for even now the distresses of the country rendered it imperative on the Legislature to take this subject into its most serious consideration, with a view to opening our markets to foreign corn. Let but the trade in corn be free, and he should not be at all fearful of the country being able to employ a greater population than at present, and maintain them in comparative comfort.

Mr. *Saville Lumley* was desirous to see every interest of the country in a flourishing condition; and was not anxious to have one interest protected at the expense of another; but, at the same time, he could not subscribe entirely to the opinions of the hon. member for Middlesex. It was not his intention to trespass on the attention of the House. His only object in rising, indeed, was, to point out the complete fallacy of the averages upon which the admission of foreign corn depends. In July last, it appeared that wheat rose to the price of 64*s.* per quarter; and the duty paid on the averages struck at that time was 22*s.* Since then, however, the price of wheat had fallen to 54*s.* per quarter, but so fallacious was the system upon which the averages were struck, that the same duty was paid now as when the price was 64*s.* He mentioned this as a proof that the parties benefitted by the present system were not the agriculturists, as was intended by the Legislature, but a certain knot of jobbers and brokers who contrived to admit or to exclude foreign corn pretty much as they pleased. He gave no opinion as to whether a duty should or should not be levied on corn, but at all events a system which was open to such abuse as that he had described required correction.

Colonel *Sibthorp* cordially concurred in the desire of the petitioners, that the taxes on malt, hops, soap, candles, and coals, should be removed; but he could not agree with the hon. member for Middlesex, in advocating so warmly a free trade in corn. If the hon. Member considered the effect that a free trade in corn must have on the agriculturists, he would see how impossible it would be for the farmer to meet the heavy payments of rates required from him. The hon. Member contended, that the benefit of the manufacturer would also be the benefit of the agriculturist. He admitted the truth of that as a general principle, but not when applied to the Corn-laws.

Mr. *Curteis,* notwithstanding the assertions of the hon. member for Middlesex, must stand by the statement he made at an earlier hour of the evening. He was very much deceived indeed if the wages, any where in Sussex, were so low as the hon. Member would have the House to believe. In the neighbourhood where he resided the very lowest rate of wages had been 1*s.* 9*d.* a-day. In some parts of the county wages had been very low; but in others experienced labourers had been able to earn from 14*s.* to 16*s.* a-week.

Mr. *Slaney* could not entertain so favourable an opinion of the condition of the labouring classes in Sussex, as the hon. member for that county. He was convinced that there was not a single agricultural labourer of Sussex who had not, in one period or other of his life, been obliged to have recourse to the parish for relief. This had been proved in evidence before a Committee appointed by the House, and he therefore entreated the gentlemen of Sussex, who, he was sure, were most anxious to better the condition of the poor, gradually to adopt the system now practised in Northumberland, where, instead of having poor-rates at 6*s.* in the pound, and wages low, the wages were high and the rates low.

Mr. *Owen O'Connor* felt much surprise at the language used by the hon. member for Sussex. He did not expect to have heard the Representative of an English county declare in that House, that the landed interests must and should be protected in such a manner as could not fail of being detrimental to the manufacturing and commercial interests of the country.

Petitions to be printed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Saturday, Dec. 18.

Minutes.] Mr. Alderman Thompson presented the Report of the Rye Election Appeal Committee, finding that the right of election was in the Mayor, Jurats, and Freemen, paying scot and lot, inhabiting the town.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Hume, the number of Officers who had been added to the Half-pay List of the Army since the accession of his present Majesty, of the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, and Major, stating whether they have been added with or without purchase.

Petitions presented. By Mr. C. Ferguson, from Castle Douglas, in favour of Parliamentary Reform; and from Trenneck, for the abolition of Slavery. By Mr. Byng, from St. Mary, Stratford-le-Bow, and from the Liberty of Saffron Hill, against the New Police; from the Overseers of the Liberty of Saffron Hill, and from the Parish of St. Luke, against the Assessed Taxes. Against Colonial Slavery, by Mr. Traill, from the Synod of Orkney, and the associated Congregations of Holme and Kirkwall:—By Mr. Evans, from Harborough:—By Mr. Pryse Pryse, six from Cardiganshire:—By Mr. Denison, three from places in Surrey:—By Mr. G. Bankes, from Dissenters at Corfe Castle:—By Mr. R. Grant, from Norwich, and St. Martin's-in-the-fields. By the Marquis of Chandos, from Lieutenant-Colonel Alexander Murray, complaining of the seizure of a vessel; and from Galway, relating to the Elective Franchise. By Mr. Alderman Thompson, from Corn-millers and others in the neighbourhood of London, against the Taxes affecting the trade in Corn. By Mr. Hume, from the Artisans of Arbroath; from Renfrew; from the incorporated Tailors of Edinburgh; from the Borough of Nairne; from the Borough and Town Council of Howick, Roxburghshire; from Cupar; and from the incorporated Trades of Aberdeen, all praying for Reform:—By Mr. Pendarvis, three from places in Cornwall:—By Mr. J. Johnstone, from Stirling. By Mr. Denison, from Bermondsey, against the Assessed Taxes. By Mr. Wyse, from Rossmore, for the repeal of the Union; from Galway, for a more equal distribution of the Grants for Education in Ireland; from Stockport, for reduction of Taxation, and especially for the removal of the Tax upon Newspapers.

Liverpool Election.] The Marquis of *Blandford* said, he understood a petition had been presented from Liverpool, praying the House to inquire into the acts of bribery alleged to have taken place at the late election there; and he took that opportunity to give notice, that after the holidays, should that petition not be taken into consideration, as he understood it was to be, he should submit a motion to the House, which would afford the hon. candidates, and still more hon. electors, an opportunity of clearing their characters from the imputations which had been extensively circulated with respect to them. On the other hand, should those charges prove well-founded, the House would have an opportunity thus afforded it, of considering whether or not it would be desirable to punish the offending parties, by disfranchising a borough in which such flagrant acts of bribery and corruption had been committed.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, Dec. 20.

Minutes.] The Colonial Acts Validity Bill was read a third time.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Lord Napier, various information from the Clerks of Supply, and the Sheriffs' Clerks (Scotland), relative to the Freeholders of Scotland.

Petitions presented. For the abolition of Negro Slavery, by the Earl of Carnarvon, from Aberystwith and Carnarvon:—By Earl Rosslyn, from Marlborough, Loughborough, and other places:—By the Earl of Carlisle, from a Parish in Yorkshire:—By Earl Stanhope, from Woburn, Marlborough, East Wickham:—By the Duke of Cumberland, from a Parish in the County of Durham:—By Lord Napier, from Longford. By the Earl of Carlisle, from certain Unitarians of Cork, praying exemption from serving the office of Churchwarden. By Earl Stanhope, from Montague Burgoyne, Esq., for encouragement to Cultivate Waste Lands.

Desire for Reform in Scotland.] The Earl of *Rosebery* presented a Petition from the Magistracy and Town Council of Linlithgow, for Reform. He could not resist that opportunity of stating to the House the conviction, which a residence in Scotland had impressed upon him—namely, that there could be no greater mistake than to suppose, that the people of that country did not feel a strong desire for an improvement in their representation. It might be true, that hitherto there had been no expression of public opinion on the subject of reform in Scotland, but the silence of the people arose from two circumstances—first, from an idea that the cause of reform was hopeless; and, secondly, from the conviction that, defective as was the representation of Scotland, the constitution of the English part of the House of Commons was such as to remedy a portion of the evil. But now that reform had been taken up by those best fitted to carry it through with success (his Majesty's Ministers), the number of petitions proceeding from Scotland proved that there was no indifference on the subject in that country. In fact the subject was taken up from one end of the country to the other. The petition prayed, not only for reform, but also for a reduction of taxation, particularly of the assessed taxes. The noble Lord presented a petition to the same effect from the inhabitants of Linlithgow.

Lord *Duncan* supported the petition, and expressed his satisfaction at finding the statement which he had made on a former evening, relative to the state of public feeling in Scotland on the subject of reform, now confirmed. He availed himself of this opportunity to say, that he did not state as he had been reported to have stated, that the member for Edinburgh was returned by three voters, but by thirty-three.

EARL STANHOPE'S REPLY TO THE LORD CHANCELLOR.] Earl *Stanhope* in presenting Petitions against Slavery, from Woburn, Marlborough, and East Wickham, observed, that, in common with every one of their Lordships, he entertained a strong abhorrence of slavery. At the same time that he made this declaration, he frankly admitted, that he thought there were considerations connected with the question which seemed extremely difficult, and which required the utmost caution in dealing with them. With respect to the condition of the negroes, he was ready to concur in any measures calculated to ensure their good treatment, and wished above all things, that they should be exempted from corporal punishments. But he was surprised to see persons in England, who affected to pity the sufferings of the slaves, offering no remonstrance at the still greater cruelty inflicted at home on their countrymen. One of the petitions attributed the severe agricultural distress that existed in this country to the vengeance of the Almighty in consequence of our tolerance of slavery: perhaps it would have been as wise to ascribe the distress to our having followed the recommendations of bad political advisers. The noble Earl then proceeded to allude to the remarks made upon him by the Lord Chancellor on a former evening. He was prepared to speak with perfect indifference, if not with contempt, of any idle and unfounded censure of his conduct or opinions, from whatever quarter it might come. He denied altogether the pretensions of any noble Lord, even of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, to dictate to him, or any Peer, how often he should speak, in what manner, or upon what subjects he should speak, or even to offer any animadversions upon his conduct. He should have noticed the matter before, but that he was prevented from attending in his place by indisposition. If the noble and learned Lord did not intend as animadversion, but by way of friendly admonition, many of the remarks which he had made, he should only say, that the noble and learned Lord had taken a great deal of unnecessary trouble, and that the admonitions would receive no attention whatsoever. He considered the noble and learned Lord's remarks as being wholly uncalled for by the occasion. With the indulgence of the House, he should, whenever public duty seemed to require it of him, venture to deliver his sentiments freely, without asking permission of the noble and learned Lord, or of any other individual.

LUNATICS.] The *Lord Chancellor* said, he proposed to move for a Return of considerable importance, viz. the number of Lunatics now under the care of the Lord Chancellor, with the date of the inquisition, the sums ordered for their maintenance, and an Estimate of the total value of their estates; and seeing a noble and learned Lord, who had given the matter a great deal of attention, having long presided with great advantage in the Court of Chancery, in his place, he felt anxious to state, in a few words, the reasons which induced him to move for the return. It was, doubtless, within the knowledge of their Lordships, that the number of persons labouring under mental disease, who were subjects of the care of the individual holding the Great Seal for the time being, was always very considerable: he might state the average number of lunatics under the protection of the Court of Chancery at 400. The returns which had been made out showed it. Those individuals had all more or less property, which was taken possession of by the Court, for the benefit of the lunatics, (should they recover), or their heirs, and managed by individuals, generally near relatives, called committees, under the control of the Court of Chancery. Out of the estates, according to the known practice of the Court, allowances were made for the support and care of the lunatics, who generally amounted, as he had before stated, to an average number of 400: the allowances also averaged a large amount, 136,000*l.* a-year. Now, generally speaking, the Court of Chancery took care that those unfortunate persons thus submitted to its guardianship, should have the benefit of all the kind and gentle treatment which it was possible to afford to individuals so circumstanced. He said, in the generality of cases the Court prescribed with great care, and, as far as it could, exercised a vigilant superintendence: but their Lordships would at once perceive the difficulty of the situation in which the Court was placed with respect to the delicate question of the possible recovery of the lunatic, who, it might be assumed, was frequently, but unavoidably, placed in the hands of persons who would, perhaps, be induced to regard their own interests more than those of their patient. The Court must delegate the care and custody of the lunatic to somebody; and the duty and emoluments of this individual ceasing with the recovery of the patient, it might be apprehended that in general he would not be very anxious for the occurrence of that event. The estate of the lunatic was, generally speaking, well watched; for first the party appointed by the committee usually had an interest in guarding it himself; and next, the Court could exercise a proper degree of control over him, and call him to account whenever it thought proper. But it was somewhat otherwise with respect to the care of the person of the lunatic, and in reference to his recovery. Here lay the difficulty. Previously to that stage there was none. For the utmost care, as their Lordships well knew, was taken, that no man should be found a lunatic without the amplest and most strict inquiry. There was, first, the protection afforded, by the individual holding the Great Seal not consenting even to the issue of a commission *de lunatico inquirendo*, till it was proved to be absolutely necessary. Then there was the inquisition itself, conducted with all the care and minute examination of a public trial; so that there was all manner of fence round the party, that he should not be rashly, or without absolute necessity, declared incompetent to manage his affairs. But it was sometimes otherwise, when the person of the lunatic came to be placed under the care of others,—at least, it was not unreasonable to suppose that a difficulty might arise in this stage, and it would be well to guard against its occurrence. It was necessary that the lunatic should receive the kindest possible treatment, and that care should be taken to afford every chance to the patient at the moment when returning health and reason might manifest themselves. It had occurred to some of the noble Lords who had preceded him in the office which he then held, that a course might be adopted with the greatest benefit to the parties in question, and that without a day's or an hour's delay being interposed. The proportion of recoveries in cases of insanity had been matter of inquiry with his noble and learned predecessor, who received reports from all, or nearly all, the lunatic asylums in the country, in reply to circulars issued by him on the subject. The circulars were forwarded to a vast number of lunatic asylums, containing not less than 25,000 patients, and reports had been received in answer, so that there was a large number of persons afflicted with mental disease from which to obtain a pretty good average of the numbers cured. It was gratifying to find that of those persons, from one in two and one-sixth, to one in two and a half were generally cured. But it was very different, of course, in cases such as he had been all along alluding to; and to apply that average in the case of Chancery lunatics would be assuming by much too great a proportion of recoveries. In the common cases from which the average had been deduced, were included all the cases of individuals sent into lunatic asylums on the first breaking out of mental disease, and never having sustained any previous attack of insanity; whereas the 400 Chancery lunatics (that was the average number) were generally persons who had been for months and months ill before a Statute of Lunacy was thought of, and in such cases the disorder being confirmed, there was less chance of recovery. If we were to say one in twenty for the recoveries of lunatics under the care of the Lord Chancellor, we should probably come nearer the mark than by assuming a higher average of cures. But that was no reason why the one-twentieth of the Chancery lunatics, or 20 out of the 400, should not have the best chance of recovery afforded them,—no reason why all should not be well treated—no reason why there should be, not only a certainty of their being thoroughly well cared for,—but a certainty of the recovered patient's being discharged at the earliest possible hour after a cure was effected. It had been thought, that the establishment of a Board of medical men, consisting—say of two able physicians, accustomed to the treatment of mental disease, but not what was called "mad doctors" (he did not wish to be understood as casting any reflection upon those useful individuals who undertook the care of lunatic asylums).—It had been thought, that the selection of two eminent general practitioners, most qualified, nevertheless, with respect to the cases in question, that their appointment, with an allowance for moderate expenses, and power to institute, from time to time, inquiries into the cases of Chancery lunatics, would be extremely advantageous. The Board would investigate the treatment of the patients, and act as a check upon the medical men under whose control they were placed: first, see that the lunatics were well cared for; but, above all, watch the least glimmering of returning sanity, and see that the parties were not detained one day longer than was required. This was a subject which had engaged his noble and learned predecessor and himself, and he thought it must be admitted that it was one that deserved—he might say required—the attention of their Lordships. The only question, as it appeared to him, was, in what way the matter could be best arranged. He certainly should be prepared, as soon as the return for which he was about to move was before the House, to state a plan calculated to effect the object in view with the greatest possible economy to the estates of the lunatics, at the same time that it aimed at as much efficiency as practicable. The lowest charge on an estate might be about 10*s*., and in no case would it exceed 2*l*. per cent. The object of this charge would be, to superintend and watch most vigilantly, with reference to the treatment and recovery of the patient, and likewise to lay down rules which would prevent any abuse upon the part of those medical officers who might be appointed, if the plan which he proposed should receive the sanction of the House. He knew that it might be said to him, that it was the province of the Great Seal, of itself to make arrangements which it might deem sufficient for the entire, wholesome, and safe management, of persons in this unhappy condition; but he deemed it to be more expedient, wherever any doubt might exist as to the jurisdiction of the Court, in applying the revenues of one lunatic to the general purposes where all lunatics were concerned, to make the arrangement a legislative measure. He would take the opportunity of the noble and learned Lord (Eldon) being in his place, to entreat his Lordship, and the rest of their Lordships, not to disdain to turn their attention to the subject before the end of the Session. He should now move for a return of the number of lunatics under the care of the Lord Chancellor, with the dates of the longest and shortest time of confinement, with the sums allowed for their maintenance, and the actual amount of their estates.

The Earl of *Eldon* was understood to say, that the noble Lord on the Woolsack had altogether proceeded on the mistake of supposing, that the Court of Chancery had the management and jurisdiction over lunatics. The subject was managed by a Special Commission from the Crown, generally issued, indeed, to the person holding the Great Seal; and, it happened, on account of the facilities which the Court of Chancery possessed for the management of property, that this jurisdiction could not be placed in better hands than in those of the Lord Chancellor. The jurisdiction over the persons of lunatics did not lie with the Lord Chancellor by virtue of his office. He should not, however, offer any opposition, or make any objection to the further inquiry into the state of such unhappy persons. He was sorry, very sorry to say, that their numbers had greatly increased since he had taken the Seals, and he would take upon himself to say, that if his conduct were to be examined into with respect to his discharge of this part of his duty, it would be found to have been influenced solely by an anxious desire to benefit the parties labouring under such a state of affliction. He could assure the noble Lord upon the Woolsack, that he would give all the assistance he possibly could to the improvement of the situation of persons under the unhappy circumstances of lunacy, and no man would be more ready to promote the views of the noble and learned Lord than himself. The noble Lord on the Woolsack might command his time and attention to further his object; and he would say, that he was as ready to give his time for such a purpose as any man upon earth. It would, however, be necessary to proceed with the utmost caution in treating the subject, and it behoved the noble Lord upon the Woolsack to consider the point, whether it would not be better to select physicians who confined themselves to the treatment of one subject, as the most likely persons to be the best judges of the disease in question.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that there was a tendency to suppose, whether right or wrong, that all medical men who devoted themselves exclusively to cases of insanity, and who kept asylums, had a prejudice in favour of making people insane. What he meant was, that they were apt to imagine and see insanity where other people saw none. The proper course to take would be, to constitute the commission of three persons, one to be of one sort, and two of the other, or *vice versâ*.

PATENTS' CONTINUATION BILL.] Earl *Grey* said, that in rising to move the first reading of the Bill, he should very briefly state the reasons out of which it had arisen. About eight or nine days ago a letter was received from the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, stating, that no new commissions of the peace had been issued since the demise of the Crown, and that it was out of his power to issue them without the order of the Executive Government; and as the Government was now in the hands of the Lords Justices, of whom he was one, he could not in one capacity issue an order which he was himself to execute in another. The commissions would all expire on the 26th instant, and it was necessary to introduce the Bill to remedy the inconveniences he had pointed out.

The Bill read a second time.

SETTLEMENT ON THE SWAN RIVER.] Lord *Teynham* rose, to call the attention of the House to the subject of the Swan River Settlement, and to put a question to the noble Secretary for the Colonies, relative to the condition of that Settlement. An extract of a letter on the condition of the settlement had appeared in *The Morning Chronicle*, which, both on account of the high character of the Paper, and the importance of the subject, was well worthy of attention. He would read to their Lordships the notice in *The Morning Chronicle*, which was in these terms:

> "*Distress in the Swan River Settlement.*—The following is an extract from a letter just received from one of the most extensive of the settlers in Van Diemen's Land:—'The Swan River settlement is with us, just now, a constant subject of discourse. Messrs. Bryan made a good speculation in the William there. Flour sold for 60*l.* per ton, potatoes for 15*l.*, and salt provisions for 8*d.* per pound; the whole of which was taken off their hands by the Governor. The live stock was unsaleable, till the Governor (Stirling) gave them a grant of 350,000 acres to put it on. The objection Mr. Bryan made to a second venture of provision was sufficiently descriptive of the state of the colony. He could not afford to supply a starving population from charity, and it was already out of their power to pay for their food. Their furniture, agricultural implements, all their preparations for comfort, are exposed to the weather, themselves are sheltered in huts formed of blankets. The country, for 100 miles round, is an arid sand or bare rock, no grass, no timber. Dr. Westbrook, who came from that place to this six months ago, told me he saw the grave for the first person who died there dug. It was nine feet deep, and the sand from the bottom was, when thrown up, fit for an hour-glass. The live stock dies in general a few days after landing, supposed to be poisoned by some herb or shrub, to avoid which certain loss, most sheep taken there to be sold, or to breed from, are killed in the ships, and retailed as fresh provisions. The bush does not help them, as here; for there are no kangaroos, nor even opossums. The place must be abandoned; and I suppose the number of people will oblige the Government to remove them to a more promising part of the coast. It is, in fact, a second Poyais. What notice will be taken of Captain Stirling's misrepresentations remains to be seen. He might be supposed to have but a slight knowledge of the quality of the land; but the very roadsted is altogether unsafe for shipping though described by him as a fine harbour. Six vessels were ashore when the Britannia was there; three of them were complete wrecks. I have seen several stout anchors broken on the coral rocks before Freemantle. Mr. Bryan reports that there are not less than 200 females there, many of them used to more than the common comforts of life, and yet they must starve, if not relieved by the Government, as their own resources are exhausted.'"

This was certainly a matter of deep and awful importance. Many people had embarked the whole of their property in this speculation, and great responsibility had been incurred, and great blame appeared to rest somewhere. Of course he did not mean to say, that any blame attached to the present Ministers, but if this representation was at all correct, blame must attach to some of their predecessors; and at all events, it was highly desirable that some satisfactory explanation should be given on the subject. Much had been said on the theory of emigration, which many persons had encouraged, from a notion that this country was over-peopled. But from what he knew of some parishes in the county of Kent, they did not contain more than the usual numbers, nor a greater number than might have been employed to advantage, if the farmers had the means of employing them. But the farmers had not the means of employing them at present, and that was one great cause of the distress. If he were to judge from these instances of the state of the whole country, he should be led to conclude, that there was no extraordinary superabundance of population. The expense of these emigrations was enormous, and perhaps it would be much better to colonize at home. A noble Lord, who had presented a petition on the subject, had stated, that he had observed, in a day's ride to town, 12,000 acres of waste land, and all this might probably be taken in with advantage, and afford employment to a great body of the peasantry. There were fifteen millions of acres of waste land in the whole country, and the taking them in might be formed into a source of employment which would make every peasant in the country happy. But no Administration had taken this matter in hand, and the people of this country were left to purchase articles from foreigners which might be very well produced at home. He hoped, however, that some plan of domestic colonization would be at last adopted; but in the mean time, he wished to know from the noble Lord at the head of the Colonial Department, whether it was the intention of his Majesty's Government to abandon the settlement on the Swan River, and whether the reports and representations as to the wretched condition of the colony were correct?

Lord *Goderich* observed, in reply, that the Government had every reason to believe that the imputations on those who had established the settlement on the Swan River were not founded in justice. It was not his intention at present to enter upon a discussion of the comparative merits of the systems of foreign and domestic colonization, nor did he mean to pronounce which was the better plan—to promote emigration, or to employ the peasantry in cultivating these fifteen millions of acres of waste land. But with regard to the particular question put to him by the noble Lord, he had to answer, that, as far as he was informed, it was not at present the intention of his Majesty's Government to abandon the Swan River Settlement. If the Government could rely on the last authentic accounts which they had received from the settlement, there was every prospect of its being a very useful establishment, and one which was likely to realize all the expectations that had been formed of it. Every one who knew anything about colonization, knew, that at the outset it was attended with great difficulties, and it was expected that those who attempted the enterprise should be endowed with those moral qualities of energy, perseverance, and patience, which such an undertaking required. But some people, no doubt, would embark in such enterprises upon erroneous views and speculations, without duly estimating the preliminary hardships and privations which must be endured in such situations, and these persons would, no doubt, be disappointed. The last communication which the Government had received was a letter or despatch from Governor Stirling to Sir George Murray, dated the 20th of January last, and that communication gave no account of the distress of the colony, but, on the contrary, was on the whole very favourable. That document was now at the Office, ready to be laid on their Lordships' Table, if called for, and it gave very full information on the subject, and the individual from whom it proceeded was well known to be a man of cultivated mind, and of talents which fully qualified him to form an accurate jugdment on such a matter. There was no objection whatever to the production of that document; and, if the noble Lord should follow up his question with the Motion which, as he had intimated to him, it was his intention to make, he would move, by way of Amendment, that a call for this document should be substituted in its place. This was the last authentic document which had arrived, and contained all the information which the Government at present had. The noble Lord must be aware, that it would be very imprudent in Government to act on loose and vague reports.

Lord *Teynham* expressed surprise, that Government should not have been able to procure information of so late a date as that which had been obtained by private individuals. Some of these had received information of so late a date as the 4th of May last, and it was singular that the Government alone should be uninformed. Some of these accounts stated, that there were no lands fit for cultivation beyond certain mountains mentioned; and that the people were suffering very considerably. He hoped that the Government would give directions to afford some relief to those who were suffering from the effects of a speculation undertaken without consideration, and concluded by moving for an account of the number of ships cleared out for the Swan River Settlement, during a certain period, and for an account of the lands in cultivation there.

Lord *Goderich* observed, that the information to which the noble Lord had alluded, as having been obtained by private individuals, was not direct from the Swan River; but from other quarters, which probably came from the Swan River, if it came at all, at a much earlier period than the information received by the Government. As to the first part of the noble Lord's Motion, there could be no objection to it, and he would only add to it, that the communication from Governor Stirling to Sir George Murray, dated the 20th of January last, be laid on the Table.

Motion agreed to.

Suits in Common Law Courts.] Lord *Wynford* moved the second reading of the Suits in Common Law Courts Bill. He would not have done so in the absence of the Lord Chief Justice, but he proposed that the discussion on the Bill should take place on the motion for committing it after the recess.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that one of the clauses related to *bona fide* possessions, and he believed that many noble Lords would oppose that clause, and object to the Bill in detail, whilst others would oppose its principle.

Lord *Wynford* said, that he should have no objection to strike out that clause, if any noble and learned Lord would take upon himself the responsibility of objecting to it.

The Earl of *Eldon* said, he should express his dissent to the clause in the committee.

Lord *Wynford* would then readily strike it out.

Bill read a second time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, Dec. 20.

Minutes.] Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Alderman Wood, number of Persons employed in the public Offices in 1828 and 1829, with their pay or Salary.

Petitions presented. By Mr. Sadler, from Newbury, for an increase of the import Duty on flour; and from a Parish in Galway, relative to the Elective Franchise. For the abolition of Slavery, by Mr. Sadler, from Leeds:—By Lord Morpeth, from Barnsley, and other places in Yorkshire:—By Mr. J. Brougham, from Kelso:—By Mr. Lennard, from Malden; and from Montague Burgoyne, praying that the Forest of Waltham might be inclosed, and the Crown compensated for its loss:—By Sir R. Ferguson, from Cupar and Nottingham. By the same hon. Member, from Dunbar, Crail, and another place in Scotland, for a Reform in Parliament; and from Kilcardy, against the Tax on Candles. By Lord Morpeth, from Barnsley, for the repeal of the Assessed Taxes.

Church Establishment in Ireland.] Sir *John Newport* said, that in moving for a return connected with the Established Church in Ireland, his object was, to avert the evils now impending over that establishment, and to correct whatever abuses there existed under the present system. He had in his possession accounts of two cases of a Distress for tithes levied in Dublin lately—the one was for fifteen, and the other for sixteen years' arrears. The hon. Baronet then moved, than an humble address be presented to his Majesty, praying that there be laid before the House a copy of the Commission issued on the 4th March last, for an Inquiry into the Established Church in Ireland.—Ordered.

Reform.] Mr. Kennedy presented Petitions from the Corporation of Glasgow, the Corporations of the Burghs of Dundee, and from the Royal Burghs of Jedburgh and Dumfries, praying for an extension of the Scottish franchise.

Sir *J. Newport* cordially supported the prayer of these petitions. He was of opinion, that a similar extension of the franchise in Ireland should be granted. In several of the Irish boroughs, the right of sending Representatives to that House was confined to a sovereign and twelve freemen, a great portion of whom were generally non-residents. Even before the Union, such, in many instances, was the case. He would mention the town of Galway as an example. He also knew three boroughs, of which the whole number of voters did not amount to thirteen, that sent six Members to Parliament. He spoke of matters as they stood before the Union, but at the same time he must remark, that this grievance, in a great measure, still continued.

Liverpool Election.] Mr. *Robinson* said, he had to present a Petition from an individual who was a party to the petition which he had formerly introduced to the House, against the return of his hon. and learned friend (Mr. Ewart), for the take place should be more distant than some hon. Members expected, he should be happy to give his most cordial support to any measure which might tend to advance the period at which so desirable an object could be obtained. He was as anxious to attain that object as any of the hon. Gentlemen who were the warmest advocates for the complete abolition. He was a Member of the House fifteen years before, when the Slave Registry Act was passed, he had given his support to that measure, and had always been happy in reflecting that he did so.

Mr. *Evans* wished to make a very few observations on what had fallen from hon. Gentlemen on this subject. When the House was told, that this question must stand, not on justice, but expediency, he must say that he could not subscribe to such a doctrine. The House was told, too, that the slaves should be better educated, in order that they might be the fitter prepared for emancipation. But he would ask the House to consult any authority, to read the public papers, and then hon. Members would be convinced that there was no disposition in the masters to prepare for the abolition of slavery, by educating their slaves. He, therefore, was not disposed, looking to what had been already done in the West Indies, to place much confidence in the planters; and if the Government did not take some steps to promote the amelioration of the condition of slaves, it would lose the confidence which he, in common with the great mass of the community, was disposed to place in his Majesty's Ministers.

Petition to lie on the Table.

TITHES IN IRELAND.] *O'Gorman Mahon* presented a Petition from the parish of Clondegad, in the county of Clare, with reference to tithes and church-rates. These rates were considered to be one of the principal causes of the disturbances in England—and innumerable petitions were presented from its various districts, complaining of them. The English petitions were all from Protestants; and he certainly thought, that petitions complaining of the exaction of church-rates and tithes, for the support of Protestant churches and parsons, coming from the Catholics of Ireland, should meet with attention. The petitioners stated, that in their parish there was no Protestant church, no Protestant clergyman, and no Protestant inhabitants, and that, notwithstanding, tithes and church-rates were as regularly enforced as if the whole parish was composed of Protestants.

Sir *R. Inglis* reminded the hon. Member that tithes were paid exclusively by the land, and if the Church did not receive them, a sum equal to them would go to the landlord, and the people would not be benefitted by the abolition of tithes.

Mr. *Hume* could not allow the observation to pass, that the landlord was the only person affected by the tithe-system, without notice. The manner in which the tithes were collected was productive of more evil than the hon. Member appeared to be aware of. No kind of tax was so productive of inconvenience to individuals, and the community generally, as tithes and the system of levying them; and he, therefore, hoped that some measure would be adopted, without delay, to effect a beneficial alteration in the system.

O'Gorman Mahon, though he wished not to treat with levity what fell from the hon. member for Oxford, could not avoid noticing that that hon. Member seemed to think that the land produced wealth without labour, and accordingly, in his estimation, the people and their just complaints passed for nothing. It was not the land, but the people, who complained that they had to pay tithes to a Protestant Church, though there was not a Protestant in the parish.

Petition to lie on the Table.

NEWGATE AND RECORDER OF DUBLIN.] *O'Gorman Mahon* rose to present a Petition from the untried prisoners confined in the gaol of Newgate, in Dublin. They complained that they had been for a long period immured in the dungeons of that gaol, and that they had not an opportunity of being tried, in consequence of the absence of the Recorder, who was attending his parliamentary duties in that House. He was bound to consider the petitioners innocent until they were found guilty, according to law, and he conceived that they had just reason to complain of this hardship. The petitioners were in number ninety-five, who had been confined on various charges, and they could not obtain a trial in consequence of the circumstance which he had stated; they were thus kept in prison, because the Recorder of Dublin, who ought to be at his post to try them, was a Member of that

House. He had also heard a complaint from a constituent of the learned Gentleman, who was now in London, and who said, that he could not get the Recorder to attend to his duty in Parliament, as he had gone back to Dublin to attend his duties as Recorder. That fact proved that the duties of the two offices were quite incompatible. These unfortunate prisoners were confined in dungeons, and could not obtain a trial because the learned Recorder said, that he must attend his duties here—and when a respectable constituent of his, a gentleman connected with the silk-trade, and who was anxious to have something done in Parliament for the employment of the people, called upon him here to bring the question before Parliament, "oh!" quoth the Recorder, "I can't go to the House when that question comes on, for I must return to Dublin to discharge the prisoners untried in Newgate gaol." Was there not reason then for the petitioners to seek for redress at the bar of that House? Was it not hard that many of them who might be innocent should be immured at this season, when every man wished to be at home with his family? It was an exceedingly great hardship upon them. One gentleman who had signed this petition, and for whose respectability he could vouch, Mr. A. M'Donnell, stated, that he was confined in Newgate, on a charge of assault—that he had been confined for a length of time, and that he could not obtain a trial in consequence of the absence of the Recorder. He (Mr. M'Donnell), also alleged that certain abuses existed in connection with the gaol of Newgate, which, if the allegations were true, should be remedied. He stated, that on one night he sent for the Protestant chaplain attached to the gaol, intimating, which was the case, that he was seriously ill, that it was a life and death case, and wanted his assistance, and that the chaplain would not come, because it was past ten o'clock; and he also alleged, that the medical men connected with the gaol refused to attend him that evening too, on the pretence that they had regular hours for attendance, and that time was not included in them. The incompatibility of the two offices of Recorder and Member of Parliament was so obvious, that some remedy should be applied to the evil in this instance. Last Session he understood that the Legislature had passed a law rendering the situation of Member of Parliament and Master in Chancery incompatible; that was the case of Mr. Ellis, who was allowed to choose between the two offices. He thought, that the same rule should be applied in this instance. There was a grant of Parliament in addition to what was allowed by the Corporation of Dublin, to the Recorder of that city; he believed it was about 500*l.* or 600*l.*, and he now gave notice, that whenever that vote came before the House, he would move, that it be withheld until the Recorder of Dublin made his selection between the office of Recorder and that of Member of that House. He repeated, that the two offices were perfectly incompatible, for even with a limited portion of ubiquity—it was impossible that the learned Gentleman could discharge the duties of both properly and efficiently.

Mr. *A. Lefroy* remarked upon the unfairness of making such an attack in the absence of the Recorder, who was, he was certain, able to clear himself from any imputations which the petitioners or the hon. Gentleman might cast upon him. He wished to know from the hon. Member, whether he was certain that the discharge of the prisoners in question was not owing to other circumstances besides the absence of the Recorder. This he knew, that previous to the Recorder coming over here, he had tried all the prisoners who were then ready for trial, to the perfect satisfaction of the public. He was also desirous to ascertain from the hon. Gentleman whether he had acquainted the Recorder with the charges which were preferred against him in this petition, previous to his presentation of it?

O'Gorman Mahon said, that one of the allegations of the petitioners was, that many of them had been confined in prison for thirty and forty days—a term too long for those who were innocent, and even the guilty had a right to be brought to trial. These men would not, surely, have been so long confined had the Recorder been at his post. He did not want to throw any imputations on the Recorder. It was manifestly impossible for him to communicate the contents of this petition to the Recorder, for he had received it since the departure of that learned Gentleman for Dublin. He must repeat, that the two offices were quite incompatible, if the learned Gentleman possessed a limited extent of ubiquity.

Sir *Robert Peel* apprehended, that the

hon. member for Clare laboured under some misapprehension or mistake in this instance, with regard to the duties of a Recorder. The hon. Gentleman had contended that the office of Recorder and that of Member of Parliament were incompatible—upon that point he should not now enter, but the hon. Member derived his proof from the fact, that some prisoners were lying over for trial in Newgate gaol, in Dublin. He believed it was the case in Dublin, as in London, that certain Sessions were held at certain periods of the year, at which the Recorder attended as the assessor of the Corporation, and at which the prisoners ready for trial were put on their trial accordingly. If the Recorder attended regularly at these Sessions, he did not think that the administration of justice suffered from his being a Member of that House. He doubted whether any injustice were done to the prisoners if they were tried at the first Sessions after their commitment, provided they were ready for trial. That appeared to him the true state of the case, and if his memory served him right, the Sessions were held in Dublin as here, at stated periods in the year.

Mr. *Hume* conceived that this was a most important question indeed. The duties of the two offices were perfectly incompatible, and when the subject was mentioned, the right hon. Baronet, who was lately Minister of Justice, rose to find excuses for it. If the Recorder attended to his duty in Dublin, it was impossible that he could attend to his duty in that House. It was the duty of a Member of Parliament always to be in his place, and how could the Recorder of Dublin fulfil that duty? He wondered that his Majesty's late Government did not take up this question. He was surprised that the right hon. Baronet below him, the late Home Secretary, did not prevent this judicial officer from exercising functions so completely incompatible. He trusted that the present Government would direct their attention to the subject. At all events it was the duty of the House, when the Estimate came to be voted which included the grant for the Recorder of Dublin, to withhold it until he had made his selection between the situation of Recorder and Member of that House, the respective duties of which were so utterly incompatible.

Sir *R. Peel* was prepared to answer any charges which could be properly brought against the late Administration; but he was not prepared to reply to all the charges which the most utter ignorance of the law and constitution of the country might prefer against it. Nobody could have made such a charge unless he were more utterly ignorant than a gentleman holding the situation of the hon. Member ought to be. He would tell the hon. Member that no principle of the constitution was better established, than that the persons holding judicial situations ought to be independent of the Crown. The Recorder of Dublin was completely independent of his Majesty's Government, and he knew of no law to disqualify the Recorder from sitting in Parliament, if the electors of Dublin chose to send him to that House. The hon. Member seemed to think that the Minister for the Home Department could make the Recorder give up his situation, or resign his seat; but that Minister had no power to remove any Judge from his office. He had no more power to make the Recorder of Dublin relinquish his office than he had to make the hon. member for Middlesex relinquish his seat in Parliament. He would not enter into the question, whether or not the office of Recorder was compatible with the duties of a Member of Parliament. If the House thought the two situations were not compatible, it was for the House to alter the law, but on that he would give no opinion. He only wished to correct the misconception of the hon. Gentleman, and state that he supposed, though he did not recollect, that the custom of Dublin was like that of London, where Sessions were held at stated periods. As for the House withholding the salary now given to the Recorder, that was not under consideration; and when that part of the question came before the House in voting the Irish Estimates, the hon. member for Middlesex might take the opportunity of bringing it to an issue.

Mr. *Ruthven* explained, that the Recorder of Dublin held Sessions more frequently than they were held in London. In Dublin, he believed, the Sessions were held every fortnight. He was of opinion that there was no want of attention shown by the proper authorities to the state of the several gaols in Ireland. He knew that any letter from any prisoners to the Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench, was sure to meet attention from that officer; though he believed that trials had been postponed longer than usual, in consequence of the absence of the Recorder.

O'Gorman Mahon wished to set the right hon. Baronet (Sir R. Peel) right as to one fact. In Ireland there are no stated periods for the sitting of the Recorder. It altogether depended on his will, and this was generally guided by the state of the calendar; and if it should not please the Recorder to sit for a considerable time, or if he was absent attending his parliamentary duties, the unfortunate citizens of Dublin were mulcted in order to support the increased number of prisoners. Now, the keeping persons in prison who were supplied by the common funds, was an injury to England as well as Ireland. He held in his hand a document, giving an account of 550 English having been relieved in Dublin, 440 of whom were sent home to their own country. By keeping people in prison, the means were diminished for relieving distress. There was another circumstance, which he conceived rendered the presence of the Recorder at all times absolutely necessary. It was his duty to receive bail in the absence of the Judges of the land. This duty could be delegated to no other person. The Courts of Dublin were different from those of London—there they were empowered to issue Writs, on oath, for the recovery of debts, from the sum of 40*s*. to 60,000*l*. In a late case, a merchant of the greatest respectability, and of a most ancient family, was, on the oath of a common prostitute, obliged to find bail to the enormous amount of 120,000*l*. Had the Judges been on circuit, and the Recorder attending his parliamentary duties, that gentleman would have been obliged to remain in prison, as none but these officers were empowered to receive his bail.

Sir *R. Peel* wished again to declare, that he had not intended to canvass the question, whether the Recorder should sit in Parliament or not. He had only wished to state, that the prisoners were detained by the rules of the law, and not by the absence of the Recorder.

Mr. *Hume* said, that he did not expect that the right hon. Baronet would take up the question in the manner he had done, making an attack on him in not a very courteous and civil tone. He wished the right hon. Baronet to understand, he was not one of those men who pretended to be acquainted with every thing, nor did he say that he was not, like other men, liable to mistakes; but he was one of those men who never palliated nor protected any abuse, like the late Minister of Justice. He did not accuse Ministers; he only put a case, and said, if the late Ministers had not done so, he hoped the new Ministers would. They had only been fourteen days in office, and in that time they had not power to remedy all abuses. The right hon. Baronet, however, seemed disposed to justify his own conduct by a reference to the conduct of his successors. [Sir *R. Peel* intimated that he had done no such thing.] The language of the right hon. Gentleman implied that. He said, that it was impossible for the Government to remedy the abuse that was complained of. Why, he wanted to know, was he accused of ignorance? Because the right hon. Baronet supposed that he (Mr. Hume) thought that a Minister could displace a Judge. That was not what he said. The hon. Member opposite had made a statement, and he understood the right hon. Baronet had risen to palliate what he considered an abuse. In support of his own opinions he would refer the right hon. Baronet to his own relative, who was lately the opponent at the hustings of the learned Recorder, and was, he understood, at those very hustings. Did not the right hon. Gentleman to whom he alluded declare openly, that the two situations ought not to be held by the same person? so that if this was ignorance, he shared his ignorance with the protegees of the right hon. Bart. He thought the language he had used uncalled for, and the accusation of gross ignorance as ill-timed as it was unfounded.

Sir *Robert Peel* was obliged to the hon. Member for the lecture, which he had read to him about the use of courteous and civil terms. He had no interest or motive whatever to palliate what the hon. Member called an abuse. He had no interest in the question, and he had declared, that he would give no opinion on the compatibility of the two situations. The hon. Member condemned the Ministers for not having prevented the union of the two situations in the same person—an argument he could only have used from supposing that the Recorder held his office under the Crown.

Mr. *A. Lefroy* said, that the present Recorder of Dublin had performed the duties of his station with attention and impartiality, and he thought the charge brought against him might have been better made in his presence, or, at least, he should have had some notice of it.

O'Gorman Mahon said, he was wrongfully accused by the hon. member for Longford for assailing the learned Recorder in his absence. He had never uttered a word of accusation against him; all he had done was, to repeat the statements of the petitioners, for which he was in no way answerable; and as to giving the learned Gentleman notice, that would have been very difficult, as he was not in the way to receive it. The very complaint against him was, that he was not present where he ought to be, to perform his duties; but if he had been here when he was at home—then he might have received the notice. The fact was, he was not to be found anywhere. When asked for in Dublin, he was on the stage for London; and inquired after in London, was perhaps, in a steam-packet bound for Ireland. He hoped the hon. Member for Longford would withdraw his charge against him, of having assailed the learned Gentleman in his absence.

Petition to lie on the Table.

Duties on Barilla.] Mr. Ellice moved the third reading of the Consolidated Fund Bill.

Sir *George Clerk* would take that opportunity of asking the right hon. Gentleman, the Vice-President of the Board of Trade; if there were any truth in the report he had heard, of its being the intention of Government to reduce the duties on barilla. He had heard that the Officers of the Customs had received orders to admit foreign barilla at a rate of duty much below that ordered by the law. The House would recollect, that this subject had formerly been under discussion, and that the duty had been reduced from 11*l.* to 8*l.* 8*s.* The latter duty had been fixed by the law, and those who were engaged in this branch of business depended on the provisions of the law being preserved. They were thrown into consternation by the rumoured change. He wished, therefore, to learn of the right hon. Gentleman, if the report were true, and he hoped to hear that it was incorrect, and that the Government had no such intention.

Mr. *Poulett Thomson* was sorry to say, that the answer he had given to the question of the hon. Baronet was not likely to give him satisfaction, or to accord with his views. The Government meant to propose a bill to the House for reducing the import duties on barilla to 2*l.* 10*s.*, and, in the meantime, they had given orders that barilla should be admitted on payment of that duty, the importer giving a bond to pay the difference between that and any higher duty that might be imposed by Parliament. He had read over the negotiation, which had been carried on for some time during last year, with the kelp-manufacturers, and he understood that they were ready to admit barilla at such a rate of duty as he had proposed. He should be ready to justify the conduct of the Government when he brought in the bill, but the House would remember, that a discussion took place on the subject last Session, and it was agreed that the duty on barilla should be reduced. The present Ministers only followed the course sketched out for them by their predecessors. He had at the time concurred in the good reasons then assigned for this reduction, and he concurred in the opinions of those who thought that no injury would be inflicted by the abolition of the duty. He thought, too, that the House had consented to the principle, that the raw materials which entered into some of our most important manufactures should not be subject to any heavy duties. Barilla was much employed in manufactures; its use was extending, and, therefore, it appeared to the present Government, as to the late Government, that the duties on it ought to be reduced.

Mr. *Herries* admitted, that it was a correct assertion of the right hon. Gentleman, that it was the intention of his Majesty's late Ministers to propose to Parliament a reduction of the duties on barilla. A bill had even been prepared for that purpose; and in the bill, he was free to confess that there had been introduced a provision something like the alteration now proposed by the right hon. Gentleman. He begged, however, to say most distinctly, that, as Parliament were sitting at the time the alteration was proposed to be made, it would not have been attempted without the authority and consent of Parliament. He said thus much with reference to the case, not by way of censure, but as a warning to the members of his Majesty's Government for the future not to meddle with sources of taxation under the immediate control of the House. He must say, indeed, that, unless the right hon. Gentleman was able to state some better reason for the course he had adopted than any they had yet heard, there was no immediate justification for the haste with which he had acted, or for the manner in which the duty had been removed. Parliament had always been applied to in cases of this kind, when it happened to be sitting at the time the alteration was determined on. He recollected, indeed, one case in which the Government had taken it on itself to adopt a similar course to that of the right hon. Gentleman, and that was with relation to Mr. Huskisson's plans on the subject of the Silk-trade; but Parliament was not sitting, and although its sanction had been obtained immediately afterwards, upon a discussion in which the proposal for the reduction of the duties was consented to, yet the course had been found so inconvenient, it was not afterwards resorted to. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by declaring that he was favorable to the reduction, and so were the members of the late Government; but he thought the course adopted in making the alteration, one which should not have been made use of while Parliament was sitting, and, as far as he could see, unoccupied with any business of importance, which would have delayed an application to it.

Mr. *George Robinson* said, he could not allow the opportunity to pass, without also expressing his objection to the course adopted by the right hon. Gentleman. He protested against it as unjust, and calculated to produce mischief. This was the season at which the merchants who dealt in barilla were in the habit of importing the quantity they required; and the right hon. Gentleman informed them, that those who took out their barilla under the new regulations were to give a bond for the payment of duty, in the event of its being required, if Parliament refused to sanction the reduction made by the Treasury. Now, he was at liberty to argue, that this assent would be refused. He had a right, for argument sake, to assume it; and, what, then, would be the consequence of this refusal, to those who took the barilla out for general consumption and sold it to the trade, when they were afterwards called on to make good the duty on their bond? This was one only of many inconveniences which would result from the right hon. Gentleman's interference in the present instance with a duty levied under the sanction of that House.

Mr. *Poulett Thomson* said, he thought the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Robinson) might have found a very sufficient justification for the course pursued by his Majesty's Government in the observations which had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman opposite. That right hon. Gentleman had stated, that his Majesty's late Government were themselves prepared to bring in a bill for the purpose of reducing the duties. That intention had been, indeed, formally announced in the last Session of Parliament; and although not carried into effect, the confusion and the indecision which it introduced into every branch of the trade had been so extremely prejudicial, that many of the dealers, whose future condition the hon. Member so much pitied, were already quite ruined. As to the method by which the Government had effected the alteration, they had merely followed the precedents on former occasions of the same description, and he could produce ten cases of the adoption of a similar course, and full five of them, too, without the intervening consent of Parliament. The right hon. Gentleman, who had shown so much touchiness on the subject, mentioned the case of the silk-duties; but there was also the precedent of the alteration of the sugar-duties, on which occasion the right hon. Gentleman (the then Chancellor of the Exchequer) sent an order to the Custom House on the 1st of July, to take the duty according to the new scale, before the House gave its consent to the change.

Mr. *Herries*: The right hon. Gentleman seems to forget that the House had passed a Resolution sanctioning that scale.

Mr. *Poulett Thomson* said, that at all events, there were precedents for the course adopted, and he thought that it could not be denominated in the slightest degree unconstitutional, while it must be admitted, to be productive of immediate advantage,

Sir *M. W. Ridley* also protested against the course pursued by the right hon. Gentleman as in the highest degree dangerous and injurious, and he hoped, for the sake of the kelp-makers of this country, that the determination to alter the duty would undergo some reconsideration. He was convinced that if the kelp-manufacturers of our own shores were properly encouraged, that barilla would speedily become one of the staples of the country. The manufacturers viewed, however, with the greatest alarm, the intended alteration of the duties, and he feared, if it was carried into effect, that the ruin of the home manufacturer must be the inevitable consequence.

Mr. *Maberly* was quite satisfied, that the argument of his hon. friend, the member for Newcastle, would not bear the test of examination. The adoption of any system like that which he alluded to for the encouragement of trade, would be most pernicious, and would completely fail to attain the object aimed at. What would be the effect of thus encouraging the manufacture of British barilla, by levying so heavy an impost on a foreign alkali? It would be this—to fix an additional cost on the production of every article, in the manufacture of which alkali is used; it would be to compel the manufacturer to resort to a British article, for which he would have to pay from fifty to 100 per cent, more than what he would procure a foreign article of the same quality for. His hon. friend would support the manufacture of alkali here by the imposition of an immense duty on foreign barilla. It was perfectly clear that the English manufacturer never could compete with the foreigner in the production of this commodity; and every attempt to encourage the manufacture of an article at home, by the imposition of an enormous duty on the foreign article, only inflicted a most serious injury on other manufactures in which it is used. He was surprised that any hon. Member, so conversant with trade as his hon. friend, should talk of imposing a protecting duty on an article of produce, or on a raw material, for the encouragement of our manufactures. Such a system of trade would cause distress, and would ruin many of the important establishments. He admitted that, to a particular class of manufacturers the duty in question might be beneficial; but at a serious loss to the community. It was not the interest of the country to encourage the production of an article which could be produced at so much less cost elsewhere; for it was obvious, that the adoption of such a line of policy must operate as a heavy tax on some of our most important manufactures; the demand for which, and in proportion, the demand for the labour necessary to produce them, must be in the same ratio decreased, to the great injury of that class of manufacturing labourers engaged in this branch of our trade. Mr. Huskisson stated, on the production of his schedule of duties, that it was the intention of the Government that there should be no higher protecting duty than thirty per cent. But what was even that rate of protecting duty but a tax to the amount of thirty per cent on the consumer, on all articles on which it is placed? But, in the present instance, this protecting duty amounted to more than 100 per cent. To talk, therefore, of encouraging a manufacture under such circumstances appeared monstrous: and it was a matter of surprise to him, that his hon. friend should be led away by such fallacious reasoning, the result of which, upon his own argument and shewing, if pushed to the utmost extent, would overlay and destroy the whole productive industry of the country. He would add, that if the House adopted such a system of encouragement for manufactures, it would have infinitely more complaints of distress than at present.

Mr. *Courtenay* spoke against the measure adopted by the right hon. Gentleman, and observed, that although the late Government did pursue the same course with respect to the silk-trade, they never had recourse to it afterwards. No such proceeding had been adopted whilst the right hon. member for Harwich (Mr. Herries) or Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald filled the office of President of the Board of Trade. Those Gentlemen always set their faces against the practice, from a consideration of the inconvenience which had resulted from it in the case quoted by the right hon. Gentleman. That right hon. Gentleman ought to remember, that this was a protecting duty, and that he could not abrogate it without exposing the manufacturer to great inconvenience. He regretted, indeed, that the Government had followed the only bad precedent it could find in the present instance.

Mr. *Attwood* said, the five instances alluded to by the right hon. Gentleman, even if they had been found to prove that there were precedents for the measure, formed no justification in his mind for an act of gross usurpation of the powers of Parliament by any Government, and more particularly by the members of a Government scarcely yet fully installed in the offices to which they were appointed. In his opinion, it was not for the members of a Government of that kind to take on themselves the responsibility of interfering with the exercise of one of the most important privileges of Parliament—the regulation of a great branch of commercial taxation. It was for Parliament, and not for the Government, to judge of the fitness of the reduction of the duties. The right hon. Gentleman, it was true, said, that it was determined to submit the subject to Parliament, and that bonds were to be taken for the duties; but he thought that the observations of the member for Newcastle (Sir M. Ridley), with respect to the feelings and views of the barilla manufacturers of this country, would show how unwise and impolitic had been the haste exercised on the occasion, and that Parliament were not so fully prepared to sanction the alteration as the right hon. Gentleman imagined. Parliament justly and wisely viewed with jealousy any attempt on the part of the Executive to interfere with any branch of that taxation which was only to be removed or imposed by its full public assent.

UNDER SECRETARY FOR IRELAND.] Mr. *G. Bankes*, on the question being again put, said, he wished to take the opportunity to ask a question of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir J. Graham), on the subject of the removal from office of the Under Secretary of State for Ireland. He understood that Mr. Gregory, the Gentleman who filled that office under several successive Administrations, had been dismissed by the present Government. Now, as it was a recognized principle that Under Secretaries, although removable by a new Government, were generally retained for public convenience, and because they were not supposed to be influenced by any political partialities, the dismissal of Mr. Gregory, a man possessed of great experience in his office, able to serve the public, and willing to continue his services, had excited much surprise both in England and Ireland. Under such circumstances, and when the public convenience would have been consulted by retaining Mr. Gregory's services, it was desirable to know, if it was true that he had been removed, on what ground the country had been subjected to the expense of the retiring allowance which that gentleman would be entitled to demand.

Sir *James Graham* said, he should endeavour to give a short answer to the somewhat lengthy question of the hon. Member for Corfe Castle. It was quite true that Mr. Gregory had been removed from the office he held under the late Government, because it was the opinion of the present Ministers that the removal was necessary for the public service, and they had, therefore, taken upon themselves the full responsibility which attached to it. He agreed with the hon. Member, that it was not usual to remove gentlemen placed in the situation of Under Secretary, and he also agreed with him, that one of the reasons for not removing them was because they were not considered open to political partialities; but the existence of political partiality in the present case was precisely the reason why the removal had taken place.

Mr. *Ruthven* approved highly of the conduct of the Ministers on this occasion, and declared, it was absolutely necessary for the good government of Ireland that the office of the Under Secretary of State, which had long been a nest of partiality and party spirit, should be thoroughly cleared.

LEGAL APPOINTMENTS IN IRELAND.] On the question being again put, Mr. *George Dawson* said, that as it was not probable he should have another opportunity for some weeks to come, to attract the attention of the House to what he considered an important subject, he felt it necessary to make a few observations on the recent appointments and changes in Ireland. He believed that all men were agreed on the question of the fitness of the persons who were appointed to fill these offices, and he was confident, indeed, that the learned Gentleman raised to the bench of the Common Pleas, would, in a very brief space of time, satisfy all of the propriety of his elevation. It was not so much to the men who were placed in the new situations, as to the manner in which they were so placed, that the objections were taken; and he believed he spoke the feelings of the people of Ireland when he said, that the appointment of (Lord Plunkett) to the head of the Court of Chancery had excited the utmost dissatisfaction and astonishment. On a former occasion, he (Mr. Dawson) had asked a question of the noble Lord (Althorp) with respect to that appointment, and the noble Lord seemed to know very little about it. He had, however, since learnt, that Lord Plunkett had been selected for the appointment because the Government had occasion for a political Judge. Now, in his humble opinion, Ireland had had enough of political Judges; and if the principle of selecting Judges for their politics was once to be entertained, the House would soon be visited by such a flight from the four Courts that it would soon become tired of the company of Irish barristers. It was now four years since Sir Anthony Hart had been appointed Lord Chancellor of Ireland, purely because it was agreed by all parties that Ireland required a Judge who was not mixed up with politics; and they were now told, that it was necessary to displace him for a Judge who was mixed up with politics, and whose appointment was looked on by all parties, Catholic as well as Protestant, with equal dread and consternation. It was, indeed, notorious, that Lord Plunkett was not popular with the Catholics, and was looked on with distrust by all the Protestants. They were told, however, in this country, that the noble Lord's appointment was the more worthy of approbation, because he must be ranked among the most strenuous supporters of the Established Church. But it was well known to every body in Ireland, that Lord Plunkett was bred a Dissenter, and that he is not by any means likely to be extremely zealous in favour of the Church. The measure had been recommended by the assertion, that there was to be a saving of 2,000*l.* a year in the future salary of the Lord Chancellor. All this sounded well in words, but how did it correspond with the conduct of Ministers in that House? Some ten days ago, the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, moved for a Select Committee of that House, to report on the amount which it considered fitting to be given to the Ministers of the Crown, because they thought that course would be more grateful to the country, and prove more beneficial to the public service, than if they were to make the reductions themselves; but in this case, where the salary of a great law-officer and a member of the other House, was concerned, they seemed to have no hesitation in fixing the amount of his salary themselves. There was an inconsistency in this not a little remarkable, and even ridiculous. It appeared, indeed, as if Ministers merely intended to throw a tub to the whale, for the gratification of the popular feeling of the moment; but that, in any case where a point of patronage was concerned, they could come to a decisive conclusion at once. Either Ministers had not turned their attention to the question of economy, notwithstanding all their promises—or they did not see their way clearly to a performance of them. At all events, he was sure that such proceedings would not satisfy the country. He now came to another point—the retirement of the Chief Baron of the Exchequer in Ireland. They were told, that the Chief Baron had expressed a strong desire to retire, and that twenty-five years service gave him a title to demand it. Now, when he (Mr. Dawson) was connected with the Government, he knew that nothing was then heard of the disposition of the Chief Baron to retire—nothing of his indisposition to continue to preside on the Bench; and, indeed, he might say, that the learned Judge was considered to be as fit for the efficient performance of his duties as any other in the country; but now they were all on a sudden told, that the Chief Baron was to retire, and to be bribed with a peerage for his complaisance. He did not wish to cast any imputation on the learned Chief Baron, but he wished the House to recollect how that learned Judge was situated with respect to some of the Members of the late Administration. In 1823, his hon. friend, the member for Limerick, now a member of the Government, made a motion in the House which, if it had succeeded, would have led to the impeachment of the Chief Baron. He had voted against the motion of his hon. friend at the time it was brought forward; but was it recollected by some of the hon. Gentlemen opposite, and did they recollect the position it placed them in with regard to the Judge? Did they remember what were the charges they brought forward against the chief Baron, and supported by their deliberate vote in that House? Did they remember what they had urged against the Judge whom they now advised their Sovereign to raise to the peerage as a reward for his resigning his seat at the time they required it? In the year 1823 some of the hon. persons who gave this advice brought forward a motion against the Chief Baron O'Grady, charging him with taking unnecessary and illegal fees in his Court of the Exchequer; a charge which, if entertained by the House, could have had no other effect than that of subjecting him to impeachment. The motion was lost, and the Chief Baron escaped the consequences of its being carried—he (Mr. Dawson) having, as he observed before, voted against the accusation. But what was the course adopted by the supporters of the motion? They —the moment they obtained power—rewarded with a Peerage the man whom they had proclaimed by their vote an extortioner of illegal fees. And who were the persons who composed the minority to which he alluded? Who were the Chief Baron's accusers? Why, the very first name on the list he found to be that of Henry Brougham, now Lord High Chancellor of England and Keeper of the King's conscience—the very person whose duty it became, as a public officer, to affix the Seal to the Patent of Peerage of the Chief Baron; and whose duty it became also, as Keeper of the Royal Conscience, to advise his Sovereign with truth and sincerity on his sense of the fitness of the person who was to receive such a dignity at his hands. The next name he found in the minority was that of the member for Montgomeryshire (Mr. C. W. Wynn), who was also one of his Majesty's Cabinet Ministers, bound to advise him on this subject. Then there were among others the names of the hon. member for Limerick (Mr. S. Rice), and that of the hon. member for Dungarvon (Mr. Lamb), both of them connected with the Government, and one of them (Mr. Lamb) the Under Secretary for the Home Department—an office through which the patent of peerage must pass, and in which the hon. Member would have, of course, the opportunity of pointing out to his brother, Lord Melbourne, the unfitness, in his opinion, of the Chief Baron, for the honour to which he was destined.* These, however, were the men, who, at this particular time, thought the Chief Baron no longer disqualified for the honours of the peerage; and who even recommended to their Sovereign, that the person whom they had once stigmatized by their vote, should be now bribed with a peerage to quit the Bench, and rewarded also for his compliance with 3,600*l.* a-year saddled on the country as his pension. He regretted the necessity of alluding to these matters at this moment, and of troubling the House, but he thought it of great importance, that the public should estimate properly the value of the professions of the Ministry, and that they should be informed of the degree of respect with which a Whig Government regarded the honour of the peerage, and of the regard which they really paid to their promises of economy and retrenchment.

Colonel *O'Grady* rose, to express his surprise that the right hon. Gentleman should have ripped up accusations—exploded accusations—of ten years' standing, in order to make a point against the Government, without giving him (Colonel O'Grady) any notice of his intention. Had the right hon. Gentleman done so, he should have been prepared to prove, that those who brought forward those charges against his father acquitted him of any criminality, and that the public were equally satisfied of his innocence. With respect to the imputation of a bribe to leave the Bench, he must say, that he never expected to be the inheritor of honours acquired in that manner. He knew, indeed, that it never would be his lot. The character of his father placed him above such an imputation, and he could say with confidence, that if he retired, and he was not yet convinced that it was his father's intention to retire, his retirement would take place without any regard to the official changes which would ensue in consequence of his doing so. The Chief Baron had been frequently offered permission to retire; and if, after twenty-five years service, he now accepted the offer, he was sure it was without the shadow of an imputation of impropriety. He trusted the House would pardon the time he had occupied in giving vent to the feelings which had been roused on this occasion; but he could not avoid expressing his surprise, that he had not received any intimation of this renewal of the charges against the Chief Baron.

Sir *James Graham* began, by complaining that the right hon. Gentleman had taken the opportunity of making an attack on the Government, at a time when the noble Lord (Lord Althorp) was unavoidably absent, from a domestic calamity; and his other noble friend (Lord Palmerston) was also absent, from the pressure of the most urgent public business. The defence of the measures of the Government had, therefore, fallen on him (Sir J. Graham), one of its most unworthy members; and he must take leave to trouble the House with a very few observations on the extraordinary attack which the right hon. Gentleman had made on the whole of the conduct of Government, with respect to the legal appointments. The Government to which he had the honour to belong, was on its trial before the country. It placed its title to the support of the people, through whom it hoped to maintain its power, on three great principles—a determination to produce a thorough reform in the Commons' House of Parliament; a desire to make all practicable reduction in the public burthens, and to secure the most rigid economy; and lastly, on a zealous endeavour to maintain peace in its foreign relations. These were the principles of the Government. From the trial to which they were to be subjected, then, its members did not shrink back, for they looked forward with confidence to the opportunity of redeeming the pledges they had given to their country. The right hon. Gentleman says, the House is to take the new law appointments as a specimen of the manner in which the Ministers mean to redeem those pledges. He hoped he was not to take the speech of that evening as a specimen of the courtesy of the right hon. Gentleman, or of the generosity of demeanour with which the acts of the Government were to be henceforth regarded. He said right hon. Gentleman—he at one time thought he might have said right hon. friend; but if the honour and integrity of every member of his Majesty's present Government was to be called in question, as he had heard that night, he feared he could say friend no more. He could scarcely, indeed, believe, that three short weeks could have produced so striking a change in the language of the right hon. Gentleman, and so strong an opposition to the Government, if he had not heard and seen the right hon. Gentleman, when opposed to the Ministry of the late Mr. Canning, in the year 1827. He must say that, situated as he (Sir James Graham) then was, in the absence of so many of his colleagues, he thought he might have expected greater forbearance from the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman had asserted, that it was inexpedient to make the appointment of Judges, political appointments. In the general rule he perfectly agreed with the right hon. Gentleman; but the appointment of Lord Chancellor, both in England and in Ireland, was an exception to that rule: he was the political counsellor of the Crown. The appointment of Sir Anthony Hart was an exception to the general rule in that respect. That matter had been explained elsewhere by the noble Lord at the head of his Majesty's Government. Among the many evils which had attended the non-settlement of the Catholic Question, one of the greatest (and it was so stated at the time by the right hon. Baronet, the member for Tamworth), was, that it prevented Government from being at liberty to choose certain officers whom, under other circumstances, they would have appointed. Lord Goderich distinctly stated, only a few evenings before, that this consideration had placed his Majesty's Government under great difficulty, and rendered it expedient that Sir Anthony Hart should remain Lord Chancellor of Ireland, although Lord Plunkett would have been a preferable person for that situation. As to the expediency at the present moment of having a Lord Chancellor of Ireland, whose political opinions coincided with his Majesty's Government, when it was considered that Ireland was greatly agitated, and that a powerful party was busily engaged in that country in attempting to dissolve the Union, he thought that all who agreed with him that a repeal of the Union with Ireland would be equivalent to a dismemberment of the empire, and that it would be as injurious as a repeal of the Union with Scotland, would concur in the propriety of having such a Chancellor. If that were the case, he begged to ask, whether it would have been sound policy for such a consideration as 1,400*l.* a year, at such a critical moment as the present, to deprive the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland of the valuable services of an individual, whose splendid abilities had so frequently been witnessed in that House, and of whom he might justly say, that, in point of talents, eloquence, and statesman-like qualities, no equal to him could be found in Ireland, and no superior in this country. In the appointment of Magistrates, Lord Plunkett's knowledge of the individuals, and of their qualifications, would be of great advantage. The right hon. Gentleman asserted—and the objection came with a singular grace from one who had been so staunch an Orangeman—that the appointment of Lord Plunkett to be Lord Chancellor of Ireland would be peculiarly obnoxious to the Catholics. Why, he had yet to learn. He could not, he would not, believe, that the Catholics of Ireland would view with an evil eye, one who had been among their most triumphant advocates, and to whom they were under the greatest obligation. But the right hon. Gentleman also expressed his persuasion, that the noble Lord would be equally disliked by the members of the Church of England, as his ancestors were Dissenters. But he begged to ask the right hon. Baronet opposite, whether, when the noble Lord was his colleague, he had not fought manfully in the battles which the right hon. Baronet had maintained in favour of the Protestant establishment in Ireland; and whether he had not in later years evinced an equal attachment to that establishment? Then came the expense. As his noble friend in another place had observed, it was surely no bad bargain for the public to obtain the services of such a man, and at the same time a permanent saving of 2,000*l.* a year, at the expense of a pension of 3,600*l.* a year during the life of a very old man. The right hon. Gentleman complained of a want of candour in this proceeding, and said, that the settlement of the Lord Chancellor's salary should have been left, like the settlement of other salaries, to the committee. But the right hon. Gentleman should recollect, that the appointment was to be made, and therefore it was politic to reduce the salary before Lord Plunkett accepted the office. Other offices were not under the same circumstances, and he was sure that the Administration would most readily furnish every possible information to the committee, and be able, he had not the smallest doubt, to satisfy every Member, of the propriety of the proceeding. So much for the appointment of Lord Plunkett. Of the appointment of Mr. Doherty to the office of Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, it must be unnecessary for him to say anything, as the right hon. Gentleman himself acknowledged, that it was unexceptionable. The retirement of the Lord Chief Baron, also, was an occurrence quite independent of any political consideration; and the original suggestion of that retirement did not proceed from his Majesty's present Government. The right hon. Gentleman said, that he was not aware of any intention of the Chief Baron to retire, until he was tempted by a peerage. The late Government had, however, proposed to the Chief Baron to retire; and all that the present Government had done was, to adopt such measures as might render that proposition effective. With respect to his retiring pension, the length of the Chief Baron's services had entitled him to demand that whenever he should think fit. He knew not that it was necessary for him to trespass longer on the attention of the House: if he had not succeeded in fully vindicating the Government, he was sure that it was not from the weakness of its cause, but the deficiencies of its advocate. The general disposition of his Majesty's Government to retrench as much as possible, had, in his opinion, been very unequivocally evinced. They had already reduced the offices of Treasurer of the Navy, Lieutenant-general of the Ordnance, Vice-treasurer of Ireland, and Postmaster-general of Ireland.

---

* See Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, New Series, Vol. viii. p. 1511.

Mr. *G. Lamb* begged to say a few words in answer to what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman opposite, respecting the opinions of the small minority, who, seven or eight years ago, had voted on the question to which the right hon. Gentleman alluded. As he (Mr. Lamb) believed that he was almost the only Member present who had belonged to that small minority, the responsibility of defending their conduct devolved upon him. He trusted he was not unequal to that task; but he thought it would have been more accordant to justice, although not perhaps to the right hon. Gentleman's view of it, if the right hon. Gentleman had abstained from touching upon that subject, in the absence of those who were more competent to answer. He confessed, that he was never more astonished than at the proposition which had been advanced by the right hon. Gentleman. That proposition was to the effect, that although the House had determined, on the occasion in question, that the Chief Baron should not be put on his trial, he should nevertheless be now treated as if he had been, not only tried, but convicted. Was the acquittal by that House nothing? He had always been taught to consider a person innocent before he had been tried; the right hon. Gentleman seemed to consider persons guilty after they had been acquitted. But because he had been one of a small minority who had formerly voted for putting the Chief Baron on his trial, was he therefore ever after to consider that learned person as unfit for office or for honour, and to hunt and persecute him to the end of his life? He had not a very clear recollection of the circumstances of the case; but he remembered, that after a re-consideration of those circumstances, he had not thought the case so strong a one as in the first instance it appeared to be. This, however, was certain, that Chief Baron O'Grady had been acquitted by the House of Commons, and under such circumstances, to have stopped the current of those rewards and honours to which he was entitled by his long services, would have been nothing less than gross persecution.

Mr. *M. A. Taylor* was one of those who, on the occasion alluded to, had voted for Parliament's sending the Chief Baron to trial in some other place. The minority was small, but among them were the present Lord Lyndhurst, and others whose opinions were entitled to respect. But because that was his opinion ten years ago, should he be justified after Parliament had determined against it, in maintaining, that the learned person in question should not have the rewards and honours to which his long public services entitled him? Further than that, he had never thought the case a strong one; and if he had been a friend of the Chief Baron's, he would at the time have advised him to demand an inquiry into his conduct. The proposition was, however, over-ruled by the House. He had had some connexion with Ireland, and he had never known the Chief Baron's integrity as a Judge impeached, except in the instance which had been adverted to. He was quite ready to take his full share of the responsibility of his conduct on that occasion; he did not shrink, he never would shrink, from avowing the part he had taken; but he must protest against such observations, reviving forgotten imputations, as had that night been made by the right hon. Gentleman.

Lord *Morpeth* would touch upon only one or two of the multifarious points comprehended in the attack of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. He had not the honour to know the Chief Baron; but the cause of that learned person had already been satisfactorily advocated by his most natural and competent defender. From all that he had heard of that learned person, he concurred in everything that had been said in his praise. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to consider, that the appointment of Lord Plunkett to the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland would be equally obnoxious to the Catholics and to the Protestants in Ireland. Why? No one had espoused the cause of Catholic emancipation more eloquently, more zealously, more fervidly, than Lord Plunkett; and yet, in the fullest flow of his efforts, no one had more sedulously excepted, and guarded, the interests of the Protestant establishment than Lord Plunkett. The right hon. Gentleman had expressed his rooted dislike of all political Judges. It was undoubtedly true, that Lord Plunkett was a political character; but it should be recollected that he was a Judge already. He was a Judge in a Court of Common Law. Now, it was much more convenient that a political character should preside over a Court of Equity than over a Court of Common Law; for in Ireland political considerations had much greater influence in a Court of Common Law than in a Court of Equity. What was the substance of the right hon. Gentleman's complaint? That the most eminent man in the Court of Equity in Ireland had been placed at the head of that Court. He was surprised to hear the late member for Londonderry utter expressions so strong, and which were equally applicable to almost every Chancellor in Ireland who had preceded Sir Anthony Hart.

Sir *John Newport* begged to say a few words. He was exceedingly surprised to hear the right hon. Gentleman opposite say, that the Protestants in Ireland would look with jealousy on the appointment of Lord Plunkett as Lord Chancellor. Did he forget, that a most eminent member of the Protestant Church of Ireland had married his daughter; and that two of his sons were in the Church? As to the noble Lord's having been a Dissenter, did the right hon. Gentleman forget that Archbishop Secker, and several other dignitaries of the Church of England, had originally been Dissenters? With respect to the removal of the Under-Secretary of State in Ireland, such a removal was essential to the efficient transaction of the public service, and was perfectly justifiable in principle, for that officer had often very important confidential political duties to perform at the Castle, when the Chief Secretary must be attending his duties in Parliament. He was well aware that the best devised measures of any Government might be thwarted or neutralized in their effects, by being carried into execution by unwilling instruments; for he knew, by melancholy personal experience, how unsatisfactorily business must be performed, when one had to work with such instruments. The right hon. Baronet explained his expression by stating, that when in office himself he had been greatly impeded in the performance of his public duties, by those with whom he was for a period obliged to act; and, in conclusion, expostulated on the hardship, that an Administration, but three weeks in existence, should be thus arraigned for the dismissal of one of their own officers.

Sir *R. Peel*, in what he was about to say, and he meant to advert to most of the topics which had that evening been brought before them, would avoid any reference to party. Indeed, he would not have spoken at all, had there not been a kind of personal appeal to him. In the first place, with reference to the dismissal of Mr. Gregory, he must beg to bear his strong testimony to that gentleman's merits; and he was bound to say, that whatever might be Mr. Gregory's political opinions, he (Sir R. Peel) was perfectly convinced that that gentleman would not withhold that cordial assistance which it was his duty to render to those who were at the head of his department, whatever might be their political conduct. Mr. Gregory, however, like other meritorious public servants, had been the victim of the calumnious press of Ireland. It was well known, that whatever might be the tenour of any man's conduct in that country, he became obnoxious to the severest censure from the press. Be his opinions what they might, he could not escape. He believed that all the attacks which had been made upon Mr. Gregory were unfounded. He believed that that gentleman was incapable of being swayed in his public duty by his political feelings. A man of greater integrity and honour in private life he had never met with. He was bound, however, to admit the soundness of the statement of the right hon. member for Waterford, that those who were responsible for the conduct of the Government, should be entitled to choose their own auxiliaries. No doubt, after thirty years' service, Mr. Gregory was entitled to retire. The zeal as well as the length of his services, entitled him to grateful consideration; and he hoped, that no pledge which his Majesty's Government had given of retrenchment, would prevent them from taking a just and liberal view of Mr. Gregory's claims. The right hon. Baronet had commented on what had fallen from his (Sir R. Peel's) right hon. friend near him (Mr. G. Dawson) respecting the retirement of the Chief Baron of the Court of Exchequer in Ireland. It was true that his right hon. friend had spoken of that learned Judge as "being bribed into retirement"—but what he had meant was, that his services, and the growing infirmities of years, had entitled him to retire, and to an allowance, on the appointment of his successor, but that a promotion of rank had been unnecessarily added. The right hon. Baronet was correct as to the Chief Baron's character having been untainted by the investigation which his conduct in a certain instance had given rise to in that House; and he was one of those who concurred with the decision of the House on the matter. When the subject of that learned person's conduct was before the House, he (Sir R. Peel) was in a position which enabled him to examine the circumstances of the case; and with all due jealousy for the purity of the judicial character, he could not attribute to him any undue motives. He begged to offer a few words of warning and exhortation to the right hon. Gentlemen opposite on this point. The next point he would allude to was the implied blame of the present Ministers on the late Ministry, for not having done as much as they promised to effect. The late Government had been denounced as a Government indifferent to the wants and feelings of the people, and indisposed to that rigid economy which the necessities of the times required. In fact, however, it had done a great deal towards relieving the burthens of the people. But he would ask the right hon. Gentlemen opposite, whether, short as was their experience in office, that experience did not convince them that there existed many more difficulties between them and their wishes, on the score of retrenchment and economy, than they were at all prepared to expect?—whether, in fact, it was not a very different thing, out of Office to recommend certain popular measures, and carry them into effect when in Office? Without wishing to blame Ministers for their declarations, he would say, that he drew this inference from them—namely, that they would, ere long, perceive that they had been too precipitate in pledging themselves to effect reforms and retrenchments which they would find themselves unable fully to realize. With respect to the appointment of Lord Plunkett, he willingly admitted that Lord Plunkett was perfectly qualified for the stituation of Lord Chancellor of Ireland; but by the circumstances of his appointment, his Majesty's present Ministers had subjected the country to an expense which his Majesty's late Ministers had avoided. If the conduct of the late Administration with respect to the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland were recollected, it would be evident, that at least they were not so regardless of considerations of public economy as had been imputed to them. Sir Anthony Hart was appointed Lord Chancellor of Ireland by Mr. Canning. When the Duke of Wellington came into power, however, he did not remove Sir Anthony Hart, for the purpose of appointing some individual more favourable to his political opinions. Even after the Catholic Question had been carried, the Duke of Wellington acquiesced in the continuance of Sir Anthony Hart in the office of Lord Chancellor, and thereby spared the public the expense of his retiring allowance. The right hon. Baronet opposite said, that the office of Lord Chancellor in Ireland was necessarily a political office—that it was so in England, and that it was so in Ireland. Although he would not lay down a general rule on the subject, he could not agree with the right hon. Baronet, that the Lord Chancellor of Ireland must be a political character. The Lord Chancellor of Ireland was placed in a situation different from that of the Lord Chancellor of England. The latter was *ex officio* a Minister of State, a member of the Cabinet, and exercised great influence, the former was not the political adviser of the Crown. He undoubtedly performed some political acts; chiefly the recommendation of Magistrates; but he was not the political adviser of the Lord Lieutenant. He was sometimes called in, on great emergencies, to aid the Counsel of the Chief Secretary, who was the civil adviser, and of the Attorney and Solicitor Generals, who were the legal advisers, of the Lord Lieutenant. He mentioned this, not by way of hostility to the appointment of Lord Plunkett, but to set the right hon. Baronet right as to the nature of the office of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland. Indeed, as a general rule, Ministers could not take too much pains to keep the judicial authorities of the State separate from political interference; and the truth was, that the less the Lord Chancellor of Ireland interfered with politics, the better. He had stated on a former occasion, that the people must not be too vehement in their expectations of the retrenchment which any Government, however disposed, could effect. The time was come when the relative claims of public servants on that point would be judged. The right hon. Baronet (Sir J. Graham), when he had less experience on the subject than at present, spoke of the indisposition of the Duke of Wellington to retrench to the extent necessary for the public good; now he (Sir R. Peel) would honestly and frankly, but boldly assert, that no member of any Administration had ever been more sincerely desirous of true economy than the Duke of Wellington; and that few members of any Administration had ever enjoyed equal advantages for enforcing the execution of his wishes. He allowed that the present Administration had reduced the offices of Vice-treasurer of Ireland, of Lieutenant-general of the Ordnance, and of the Treasurer of the Navy. [It was here intimated to the right hon. Baronet, that the last office was not abolished—that its salary only was saved by its duties being performed by the Vice-president of the Board of Trade.] Well, the salary was saved, but that was a species of popularity easy of attainment, and in which they might find themselves very soon excelled. He would not enter into the question as to which Administration had abolished the office of Post-master General of Ireland; but he would affirm, that it was the intention of the Duke of Wellington to abolish that office. He attached, however, but little importance to the abolition of one or two offices, and if the present Ministers did, could they think that what they had already done would be considered sufficient? Would it not be very easy for anybody to outbid them for popularity? Would it not be very easy for any man, with more extravagant views of what was practicable than those of the right hon. Baronet and his friends, to say to the people—" I will carry on the public service on cheaper terms: I will abolish the office of Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster; I will abolish the office of Lord Privy Seal; I will abolish the office of Paymaster of the Army?" Would he (Sir R. Peel) join in countenancing any such declaration? Certainly not; because he knew the impossibillity of carrying it into effect. Did they not feel that the efficient strength of the Government for the conduct of public business was not sufficient; and although they might wish to secure to every man throughout the country the full reward of his labours, did they not feel it was but a delusion to hold out to the country at large the expectation of any extensive reduction in the expenses of the Government; at least, that any such extensive reduction was inconsistent with the means of properly conducting the public business, considered not with reference to the individuals concerned, but with reference to the discharge of public affairs? He said with them, let every office that was not absolutely necessary be cut down—let them dispense with all those places with which they could dispense: but he hoped that no attempt to catch the shadow of a fleeting popularity would induce the Government to waste its proper strength. The question, after all, became one as to the merits of the late Government, and must be decided when they could properly see whether the condemnation pronounced against that Government, on the ground that it had not sufficiently diminished the public expenditure was well founded [*Sir J. Graham nodded assent*]. If the right hon. Baronet could, as by that applauding motion of his head he seemed to intimate, show that much greater reductions than those made by the late Government were practicable, no man would be more delighted than he (Sir R. Peel) at such a circumstance. It would certainly prove, that the late Government might have done more; and over the advantages which would be obtained by the country he should heartily rejoice, though he must at the same time share in the condemnation of not having before conferred them. He would only caution his right hon. friends, in the most friendly spirit, not to pledge themselves too hastily to a sweeping retrenchment, before they had examined all the details of the offices with which they were connected—not to promise that reduction of salaries which they might afterwards find would weaken the public services, and not to encourage the public too much in expecting that diminution of offices which might afterwards be found inconsistent with the safety of the country. The present Ministers had pledged themselves to reform, to economy, and to the maintenance of peace. With respect to reform, that was not the time to say anything about it. The measure was one of too much importance to be introduced incidentally into discussions of that kind. He would, however, say, that he trusted that the declaration of his Majesty's Prime Minister, that no measure of Reform, not consistent with the maintenance of existing institutions, should be introduced, would be strictly adhered to. With respect to retrenchment, that must be the profession of all Governments—it was so of the present—it had been so of the last; and though Members in opposition might find fault with the continuance of this or that office, it was his firm belief that not five years would elapse without the conviction arising in the public mind, that these professions had been fulfilled by the Duke of Wellington's Government. With respect to the maintenance of peace, though it was a popular topic, he was sorry to hear the present Ministers state it, as a distinguishing mark of policy, that they were determined, at all hazards, to maintain peace. Of course every Government must wish to preserve peace. The late Government had always stated that to be its wish, and there was no Government but what did so; it declared, that it would leave no effort untried, consistent with the honour of the country, to preserve peace. No man felt more than he did the immorality of war, and the necessity of avoiding the rekindling of its flames—no man was more deeply convinced than he was, that this country was interested in making peace—but peace was not always the only question; it was not always to be obtained or preserved at the wish of the Government, and he doubted the policy of too strong and determined a declaration, that at any hazard the Ministers of this country would preserve peace. He knew that the explanation of this was, that they would do all they could to maintain peace, but that explanation brought the matter back to what was said by every Government. All he complained of was, that when the Government of the Duke of Wellington, which was essentially pacific, had confined its declarations to the limit of maintaining peace to the utmost extent, consistently with the honour of this country, the present Ministers should have put it forward prominently, as one of their principles of Government which was to distinguish them from the late Ministry, that they would maintain peace at all hazards. He concurred with them in thinking that every effort, consistent with the honour of the country, should be made for the preservation of peace; but let not the expressions of their determination to preserve it at all events, be too strong; for the interests of this country, or circumstances, which at this moment it was impossible to foresee, might compel them to change their determination; and those circumstances might possibly be created by too strong a manifestion of their wish to preserve peace. He called on them to show, as the late Government had done, that in the event of there being a necessity for resorting to arms, they would at once take up arms. He called on them, not only to show this, but their conviction also that, in the event of such a necessity, they could repose with confidence on the belief, that the ancient spirit of the country would rally round the Government, and carry on with courage, with vigour and effect that contest which their judgment had declared to be inevitable. The right hon. Baronet had complained of the course pursued by his (Sir Robert Peel's) right hon. friend, as intended to obstruct the proceedings of the Government. He denied that such conduct could be justly imputed to his right hon. friend. The right hon. Baronet supposed, that that course of conduct proceeded from pique at the loss of office. For himself, he could assure the House, that so far as place was concerned, if he never returned to it he should not consider it a misfortune; and that if he ever should be recalled to Office, so far as his personal feelings alone were concerned, he should feel it little less than a great calamity. Having said so much with respect to the points on which he could not concur with the present Government, he was happy to be able to express his full concurrence with them in one matter of great importance; he was pleased, much pleased, with the declarations they had made, that they would support, at all hazards, the Legislative Union of England and Ireland. He suggested to the right hon. Baronet, and to the other advisers of the Crown, whether, if those who agitated this question, but were determined not to bring it forward, since they avoided discussion, for the purpose of continuing agitation—he suggested, he said, to the present Ministers, whether it would not be better to place on record the opinion of that House—to move a resolution declaratory of the opinion of the Legislature? Those who thought that the Union ought to be dissolved, ought to submit the question, not to popular agitation in Ireland, but to the deliberation and sanction of those branches of the Legislature which were, and ought to be, the sole tribunals for deciding it. He hoped that the young Members of that House, the Gentlemen who, as Catholic Members, now, for the first time, sat amongst them, would show that, whatever distinctions might have once existed—whatever matters might have once created division—the most heartfelt cordiality united them in preserving that important union. He would gladly sacrifice the office and power he had once enjoyed, if the present Ministry, more than the last, could secure the declaration of Parliament, that England and Ireland should share their fortunes in peace; and if war was unavoidable, that they would fight united together, and by their union attain that triumphant success which they could not hope to enjoy if they were divided. He hoped, too, that out of doors the people would not be misled by the declamation of affected patriots. He hoped that before the inhabitants of Dublin could be induced to follow the example of Belgium and Paris, they would well consider whether they had the same justifiable cause of opposition to the Government; and even when they had settled that point, he trusted that they would well consider what was the present condition of those countries in which Revolutions had taken place, and compare it with the state in which they were before the Revolutions had begun. In saying that, it was not necessary to call in question the justice of the resistance these people had offered to their late governments, it was not necessary for him (and, indeed, no circumstance could induce him to do it) to palliate the conduct of those governments; but although the resistance was justifiable, he had a right to inquire whether Revolution was not a great evil; and when he looked to the condition of France and of Paris, and particularly to the condition of the working classes, he could not help thinking he was justified even in believing, though resistance might be justifiable, that it involved those who engaged in it in almost irremediable ruin. He called on the House to compare the state of the public funds in France with their state before the Revolution. The resistance was right; it had been successful; the most popular men were in office; yet how was it that property was deemed insecure; that employment was almost at an end; that industry was paralysed; that strangers were withdrawing from the country, and that the condition of the lower classes was infinitely worse than it was before the Revolution? If it was so, as he believed it was, then he asserted it to be true, that great changes in any government could not take place without exciting alarm and despondency, and without materially and injuriously influencing property in the country in which the Revolution took place. He called on the House—he called on all people of property—to be fully aware of the mistake they would be committing, in dividing this country and Ireland, and to be aware of the irreparable evils that must result to both from such a measure. All people of property were interested in this question, and on them he called for a calm, considerate, and full attention to this subject. In what he had said, he had not any intention to stop the course of fair economy, but it was impossible to read the public Press of this country, and to see its appeals to the passions of the people, without knowing that while economy was put forward as the avowed object, the covert design was, to degrade and lower all the constituted authorities of the country, and to secure for public writers that power and authority which would be denied them under all other circumstances. To gain that end they were willing to create tumult and confusion, and to subject this country to the worst and most degrading of tyrannies—the tyranny of an ungovernable mob.

Mr. *Hume* thought the discussion now introduced had been most unnecessarily commenced, and he entered his protest against the mode adopted by the right hon. Gentleman to prejudice the minds of the Government and of that House against the adoption of measures of Reform and Retrenchment.

Sir *R. Peel* said, he had not the slightest intention to create any prejudice against Reform or Retrenchment, both of which he should be happy to see effected, provided they did not injure existing institutions.

Mr. *Hume* maintained, that such had been the tendency of the right hon. Baronet's observations. He advised all the advocates of Reform and retrenchment, to look at the condition of France and Belgium, and he held up the misfortunes of those two countries in *terrorem,* over those who sought to improve our own institutions. He agreed with the right hon. Baronet, that the Revolutions in those countries had led, as might be naturally expected, to much present misery; but he believed, that timely Reform and retrenchment would be the means of preventing such a Revolution here. The right hon. Baronet had read a severe lecture to the lower classes, and to those who called for retrenchment, economy, and Reform; but had he read a similar lecture to the higher classes, who had brought this country to its present state? No such thing. Had not the Government which preceded the present, positively and distinctly refused all Reform, which the people had called for year after year? The right hon. Baronet spoke of preserving existing institutions. The people did not wish to set aside those institutions, they only wanted to reform the abuses that had crept into them. He hoped that his Majesty's present Ministers would not listen to the advice given them on that side of the House [*cheers and laughter.*] Oh, he knew what those cheers meant—he was sitting on that side, but then he was an exception; he was not properly a part of that side of the House: that side of the House was now in possession of those who had recently sat on the other. He was not one of their body—he was, as he had before said, an exception to the rest. Perhaps he might differ but little from the right hon. Gentleman, as to the salaries to be paid to the efficient servants of the public, but there were others about whom some doubts might well be entertained. When he looked around him he saw numerous offices that might be reduced wholly, or in part, without any injury to the effective service of the country. He hoped, that the present Ministers would adhere to the promises they had given of retrenchment, and not risk the advantage of being supported by the country by deserting their promises. He should be glad to know what the right hon. Baronet meant, when he spoke as if there could be no reduction of offices without injury to the public service, and when he talked of preserving existing institutions? Were there not pensions and sinecures increasing the Dead Weight, and rotten boroughs, whose occupants were put into useless places by the Government? After the explanation given by the hon. and learned member for Weymouth, on the subject of the abuses in the Court of Chancery, he feared he could not point out one thoroughly good institution, and therefore he was afraid of Reform. That speech shewed such a mass of corruption existing in that which should preserve the integrity and honesty of others, that he despaired of being able to effect Reform. The people, however, did not want to destroy existing institutions, they only asked to have some control over the taxes to which they contributed. It was only Reform that would enable honest men to act as Ministers, and to conduct the affairs of the public in that House. The right hon. Gentleman had talked of his personal feelings, as opposed to his being in office. Those feelings, no doubt, arose from the difficulties he had to contend with while in office. Those difficulties would be at an end in a reformed Parliament; and, under such a Parliament, he should be glad to see the right hon. Gentleman in office. The right hon. Gentleman said, that he did not like the distinct pledge of peace given by the present Government. If there was any one thing better than another in the conduct of a Government, it was the making a distinct pledge that they would not interfere with the affairs of other nations. It was that interference which had added 600,000,000*l.* to our Debt; and it was the successful issue of that interference in replacing the Bourbons on the Throne of France, on which the late Lord Liverpool congratulated the other House of Parliament; though he, and those in office with him, had frequently before declared, that the defence of our own country, and not the re-establishment of the Bourbon family, were the objects of the war. He repeated that he was rejoiced at the pledge of non-interference given by this Government, and he conscientiously believed, that if the Duke of Wellington had continued in power, this country would have been at this moment, if not in actual war, at least on the verge of hostilities. He was, therefore, glad that the late Ministry were no longer in office, and that the present Ministers had pledged themselves to the maintenance of peace. With respect to what the right hon. Gentleman had stated regarding Revolutions, he must say, that if the party who held the Government, broke the conditions on which they held it, the people had a right to put an end to the Government; and that had been the case in France. Although, therefore, the right hon. Gentleman had condemned the French, he could not but admit that the government had no right to issue the Ordinances, and therefore he must admit that the people were right in resisting them. He wished the Poles as much success as had attended the French; but he declared, at the same time, that it was no part of the duty of Government to interfere.

Sir *R. Peel* had not condemned the French—he had said that they had no alternative but resistance, and had only observed, that lawful as was the resistance, it was still unfortunately true that the Revolution thus occasioned, though successful, had been productive of much misery.

Mr. *Leader:* Sir, the hon. member for Middlesex has made so long a digression from the subject immediately before the House, that I almost regret that my connection with Ireland makes it a kind of personal duty on me to make a few observations in reply to the right hon. Baronet, who addressed the House at such length, and with so much ability, on the subject of the recent law appointments in Ireland. I admit that I have felt deeply on these appointments. I hope I entertain the opinions which an independent, considerate, and fair man, ought to feel on such an occasion. All those who have addressed the House on the subject of these appointments, have confined their observations to the personal claims and merit of Lord Plunkett. Sir, with the greatest deference, there is a person left out of the consideration of the question, whose station, whose feelings, and whose responsibility, ought not, in times of such immense public difficulty, to be treated lightly, or inconsiderately overlooked,—Sir, I mean the first Lord of the Treasury, and Prime Minister, Earl Grey. Sir, when that distinguished nobleman and statesman was called on to form an Administration, what was the state of public affairs? Will any man say, that the foreign and domestic concerns of the country were ever in so critical or so embarrassing a situation? Was not the continent of Europe exposed to a political earthquake and a moral convulsion, which bore no similitude or resemblance to anything that had happened at any former period? Will any Gentleman deny, that the state of this great metropolis had assumed an unusually agitated and almost insurrectionary appearance? Can any man deny, that the surrounding counties were not one scene of connected and apparently organized rustic combination, in which there was no respect for property, and, probably, as little even for life? With regard to Ireland, can the greatest enemies to the Administration have the courage to rise in their places and assert, that the aspect of affairs in that country was not such as to make it absolutely imperative on any Minister to feel an intense interest in adopting any practical measure, and make such arrangements as were likely to be conducive to its future prosperity and peace? If this be no exaggerated picture of your affairs at home and abroad, was it surprising in Lord Grey to repose his confidence in, and divide his responsibility, as far as Ireland was concerned, with my Lord Plunkett? Sir, that nobleman is not a stranger to either House of Parliament —he is, on the contrary, well known to both. Sir, I claim for Lord Grey, in the appointment of Lord Plunkett, the benefit of the eulogy which the right hon. Baronet, the late Secretary of the Home Department, has pronounced on his late colleague and friend. I do not look to Lord Plunkett, whose talents have been so justly eulogized, so much as I look to Lord Grey, who has a heavy weight of responsibility impending over himself. Would any man assert, that even in last summer the north of Ireland did not exhibit a theatre of frightful party and political dissensions, principally arising out of religious prejudices and aversions? And was it not at least desirable to give the Catholic Relief bill a fair trial, and impose on the principal promoter of that important and healing measure—a man admirably conversant with the artful and selfish policy of its opponents—the power, by high official situation, of contributing to its final and complete success? Called on as Lord Grey was, under the circumstances I have described, was he to be condemned for addressing himself to Lord Plunkett and saying—"Sir, you have been the great advocate and champion of the removal of civil disabilities for religion in Ireland, and your country, so far from being tranquillized by your measures, appears to be now exposed to increased agitation and excitement. Under such circumstances your counsel and assistance are essential to the measures of my Government, and I repose in your judgment and qualifications one of the highest offices of the State, in the hope that you may assist the King's Government, and share the heavy responsibility imposed on myself." Under these circumstances, in my honest judgment I must say, that Lord Grey exercised a sound discretion—discharged, to the best of his opinion, a solemn duty—and that it is utterly impossible for any person, disposed to make fair allowance for a public man, not to concur immediately in the justice of the conclusion, that no fair blame, but, on the contrary, just praise, is due to Lord Grey for a sound exercise of calm and deliberate reflection in the selection and appointment of Lord Plunkett. The next appointment is that of the late Attorney-general, Mr. Joy, in the room of the Lord Chief Baron. I believe in the propriety of this appointment: there is not in either country, or in either House of Parliament, a dissenting voice. For years Mr. Joy has held a distinguished station at the Irish Bar, he possesses public confidence, and has the strong claim of great length of official service. Mr. Joy is supposed to be inimical to Catholic claims, but, notwithstanding, there is no second opinion amongst the Bar of Mr. Joy's qualifications and legal acquirements to fill the highest judicial situation. The retirement of the Lord Chief Baron has been alluded to with unmeasured—and, after a solemn acquittal in this House, with, perhaps, unmerited—obloquy and severity. Let it be remembered, that it was in the House of Commons the conduct of Chief Baron O'Grady was most deliberately and carefully investigated—that it was in this House the charges were brought forward, and, it must be presumed, fully and satisfactorily answered, as the House dismissed all the charges. After having filled the office of Attorney-general for a number of years, and being raised from that situation to a high judicial office, I cannot say that the *quiddam honorarium* was improperly or discreditably bestowed; I cannot bring myself to think, that his retirement ought not to be marked by the same reward which has, in most instances, been conferred on those who preceded him, even on their judicial elevation. I have the misfortune not only to differ from right hon. Gentlemen in approving the appointments which they condemn, but to differ from them also in the appointments they have so highly eulogized and applauded. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Dawson) has complained that the effect of political characters—such as Lord Plunkett—being promoted to the Irish Bench, would have the effect of encouraging a flight of legal adventurers to make a perching place in this House. Has the promotion of Mr. Doherty, which the right hon. Gentleman so zealously eulogized, been such an appointment as to increase or diminish the fear of such an occurrence? Sir, I know of no appointment which could be more likely to have the latter effect. Sir, if there be any part of the arrangement objectionable in the opinion of the eminent and distinguished Bar, of which Mr. Doherty was a member—it is Mr. Doherty's elevation to the Chief Justiceship of the Common Pleas. It is not to be concealed that the opinion of the Irish Bar was unfavourable to that appointment—that it gave general dissatisfaction, and, as far as public opinion went, that it was hostile to his promotion. I shall conclude my observations on these legal appointments by saying, that I approve of that part of the arrangement which the right hon. Gentlemen (Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Dawson) have so unsparingly censured, and I disapprove of the part of it which they have so warmly praised. I cannot concur either in their censure or in their praise. It has not been my habit, and it is quite repugnant to my nature, to wound the feelings of any person; and I have the consolation, that if I have erred, I have not been singular in the expression of my dissent, to the glowing and eloquent eulogy which the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Dawson) has pronounced on the great legal talents, professional eminence, and distinguished forensic ability of his friend Mr. Doherty. Sir, the right hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Peel) has not confined himself to an inquiry into the propriety or impropriety of the Irish legal appointments, but he has entered on a larger and more expanded inquiry—the present state of Ireland, and the necessity of the Government making it an object of their most peculiar solicitude. The right hon. Baronet has been pleased to express an opinion, that as the question of the repeal of the Union was not likely to be brought under debate by those avowedly favourable to that subject, it would be the duty of Government to come forward, and take the sense of the House and pronounce a very decided opinion on that subject. Undoubtedly, it is competent to the House to pursue such a course as it deems advisable and expedient; but, in my opinion, Sir, there is a far better course for calming the Irish mind, and reconciling the country to its present legislative connection, than a barren resolution "to lie on the Table," and cease to be recollected after it is passed. Sir, when the right hon. Baronet commenced his political life as Secretary for Ireland, every interest suffered materially by the transition from war to peace,—there was no market for Irish produce—every place was glutted with provisions—the private banks failed—and public and private credit were exposed to dangers which it was frightful to contemplate. The measures of that right hon. Gentleman relieved the country; the improvements of the right hon. Gentleman were not only effected without pecuniary loss to the public, but had the merit of being as permanent in their utility as immediate in their relief. I wish to know why measures like those which originated with the right hon. Baronet were discontinued? I ask why did the colleagues of the right hon. Baronet abandon the system which the right hon. Baronet had originated and worked prosperously for Ireland, and profitably for Great Britain; and what was the necessity or occasion for their taking up the wretched system of assimilating the taxes of a poor country to those of the richest country in the world? Why did they announce their intention to tax the Press, and assist in raising the repeal of the Union, which he now deprecates, and marshalling the whole body of the Irish Members in the ranks of his political antagonists? Sir, I readily admit the inestimable blessings which would result from a real union of Great Britain and Ireland; but I assert, that in this House the proper steps are not taken to consolidate and effect it. Sir, the right hon. Baronet knows well the evils by which Ireland is afflicted, and no person knows better than he does that the means of the country have declined materially in value, and that it is now without anything to exchange but the produce of its soil for every luxury of life, and that produce has suffered a most discouraging reduction in price. Sir, I lament the inability of Ireland to contribute much more largely to the relief of Great Britain; but the right hon. Baronet is surely aware that the duties in Ireland on Customs and Excise fall on articles which, in towns particularly, are the very necessaries of existence, and which no earnings in those towns will enable families to purchase. Sir, I contend that tea, sugar, tobacco, and other such articles, ought to be within the reach of the labouring poor; and that any deficiency of revenue, by reducing duties on those necessaries, should be made up by making the rich the contributors. It is the fashion to say Ireland is lightly taxed. Sir, the taxes on those articles, which may be called necessaries, are equal in value to all the exported corn of Ireland, and probably not less than three millions sterling per annum. It is in vain, in the cities and large towns in Ireland, to reason with workmen who have low wages, or none at all, on the necessity of high taxes. In Ireland, the great weight of taxation presses heavy on the working poor, whilst absenteeism, by abstracting from the natural annual returns of productive industry, deprives the people of the vivifying influence of that capital, which, if admitted to fructify in the hands of an industrious community, would lay the foundation of permanent prosperity and national contentment. It is the imperious duty of this House to become itself the great agitator of every measure connected with the improvement of Ireland—political speculations are inseparable concomitants of the multiplied evils arising from an unemployed population. It is easy to lose, and difficult to regain, the affections of a people. The truth is, Ireland has been shamefully and cruelly neglected. But I hope the time has arrived for removing every trace of the ruinous policy which has been pursued towards her—to foster and develop her resources—to repair the dilapidations which neglect and impolicy have produced in both the social and political system—and realize the hope which every one expresses (but which was, unfortunately, forgotten the moment it was uttered) of her becoming a wealthy, vigorous, and truly integral portion of this great empire.

Mr. *Slaney* believed there were but few who listened to the bad advice of the press to which the right hon. Baronet had referred, so that the poison, unless it spread widely, could do little harm to the community at large. He was persuaded that discontent would subside, and finally disappear. It had been excited by the positive declaration of the last Ministry, that there should be no reform. The present Government was pledged to a reform, not only speedy, but effectual, and the people would wait patiently for the redeeming of that pledge, in the confidence that they should not be disappointed. Even if the lower orders should not be satisfied, the middle classes would loyally rally round the banner of a constitutional monarch. Much had been said on the subject of distress; and from some experience in the southern counties, he was convinced that the distress, at least there, was by no means irremediable. If Gentlemen would but return to their estates, and make those exertions which the situation of the peasantry demanded—if they would come forward to give employment to the poor during the severity of the winter, a beneficial change would be soon visible.

Mr. *G. Dawson* explained, that he did not intend to be guilty of any want of courtesy towards the right hon. Gentleman, especially in not communicating the nature of the statement he had to make: the fact was, that it was called for on the sudden, by the unfair removal of Mr. Gregory. He, however, begged to apologise to the hon. Baronet for the use of the word "bribe," which had escaped from him, while he only meant it in the sense of inducement. In what he had said, he had not intended to express the slightest personal ill-will.

The Consolidated Fund Bill was then read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT AND BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.] Sir Robert Peel having moved the printing of certain Parish Returns, which ought to be in the hands of Members during the approaching recess,

Sir *J. Graham* said, he would take that opportunity, in the absence of the noble Lord (Althorp), of stating the intended arrangement of public business. It was to be proposed that the House, at its rising this night, should adjourn till to-morrow; to-morrow it would be moved that it should adjourn at its rising until Thursday; on Thursday it was intended to move, that the House should adjourn for the recess until the 8th of February. On the 15th of February the House would commence with the Election petitions, in the order in which they stood in the book; three ballots would take place on each of two days in the week, viz. three on every

Tuesday, and three more on every Thursday, until the House arrived at a series of petitions, all of which were presented in one day: the priority of those would be best decided by putting them into one urn. There was one exception—the petition from Wigan—the sitting Member for that borough having relinquished his seat: the representation was, therefore, so far incomplete, and in order to remedy the defect it was intended to take that petition into consideration first on the 15th February. He mentioned this as the proposed arrangement, without wishing it to be understood that some variation might not be made by circumstances. The principle was, that all the ballots should be completed before Easter.

Sir *R. Peel* was quite aware of the circumstances in which Ministers were placed, and of their natural desire to have an interval of time to make certain preparations; but he could not help saying, that he thought the proposed adjournment too long, looking at the very little business that had been already transacted. He had no wish to embarrass Ministers, and he admitted their claim to an opportunity of maturely considering their measures.

Sir *J. Graham*, in the absence of his colleagues, did not intend to enter into discussion upon the subject; he only meant to give notice, that on Thursday the Adjournment would be moved. The right hon. Baronet had disclaimed all intention to embarrass Government, and he could not but be aware that time for deliberation was absolutely necessary. He hoped, therefore, that the Adjournment required by his Majesty's servants, to the 8th of February, would not be opposed. So far from its being the cause of delay, he thought that this lengthened recess would be actually the means of expediting public business, as it would give Ministers leisure to prepare and adjust measures adapted to the circumstances of the country.

COURT OF CHANCERY—ADJOURNED DEBATE.] The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on this subject having been read,

Mr. *M. A. Taylor* addressed the House. He said, that his learned friend (Sir E. B. Sugden) below him, seemed to think that he (Sir E. Sugden) had stood forward the other night, for the first time, as the first exposer of the abuses of the Court of Chancery. His learned friend, however, was, he would himself admit, in error upon that point, and there was no exposure which his learned friend had put forward which, together with a great many more, had not been over and over again pressed upon the consideration of the House, by himself, as well as by many other Members; or to which the attention of the commission appointed to inquire into the Court had not been forcibly drawn. Besides, he could not help remarking, that during the time his learned friend and the late Lord Chancellor had been in office, notwithstanding all they had advanced upon the evils, no one practical benefit had been extended to the suitors of the Court. His learned friend had stated, that motions on this subject had been opposed on political grounds. This was quite true; he could confirm it by his own experience; for, when he brought forward a motion on the subject, while Lord Eldon held the Great Seal, he was opposed by the then Government,—and why? Because Lord Eldon threatened to resign if his motion were agreed to, and had added, that he would admit of no reforms into his Court. His authority, on this occasion, was the best,—for it was Lord Eldon's authority. That noble Lord himself told him the fact. He had brought forward a motion in 1810, and all those subsequent to that period, were defeated on similar grounds. At last the Chancery Commission issued. That commission, after sitting two years, made a report, and Lord Lyndhurst, then Attorney-general, opened the proposed alterations, and gave notice of a bill for that purpose. That bill, however, was never brought forward. At a subsequent period, Lord Lyndhurst did offer his bill. This was in 1827, he believed, but the bill so introduced did not embrace half the objects which the commissioners had in view, and which Lord Lyndhurst had alluded to in the plan of reform which he had opened to the House in 1826. Owing to some differences which arose between Mr. Canning and Lord Lyndhurst, and which had their origin in a speech upon the Catholic Question, Lord Lyndhurst refused to go on with the measure, and it fell to the ground. In 1828 he (Mr. Taylor) called upon the Ministers to take some step; still nothing was done. In 1829 a bill was moved for in the House of Lords by Lord Lyndhurst: it passed that House, and came down to the Commons: but the Ministers did not press it, and the then

Secretary of State for the Home Department stated, that as it had come down so late it was impossible to carry it through the House in that Session. In the last Session another bill was introduced in the same way; but that also ended in nothing. From this history of what had been done, or rather what had not been done, during the space of twenty years, the House, he was sure, must see, that unless a committee was appointed of a different complexion, or unless the Chancellor himself would take the matter into his own hands, the abuses complained of never would be redressed. The Chancellor could do much. The Chancellor, for instance, was competent to carry into execution nine-tenths of what his learned friend proposed should be done. It was said, that the Rolls might be made a more efficient Court. He had no doubt it might be: but see how the matter stood now. At the present moment, the Master of the Rolls had not a single cause before him, while the Vice-Chancellor laboured under the pressure of upwards of 200 causes. The Master of the Rolls had offered,—and he felt that he should be acting most unjustly by the Master of the Rolls if he omitted to state the fact, and to add, that the Master of the Rolls was one of the ablest Judges who ever presided in a Court of Equity—the Master of the Rolls had offered, if the Bar and the parties would consent, to divide these causes with the Vice-Chancellor, and hear one half of them himself. The root of the evil, was not, however, limited to the hearing alone; it was to be found in the absurd length of the pleadings in the Masters' offices and in the Six Clerks' office. His learned friend (Sir E. B. Sugden) had adverted to a plan the other night, of putting the Six Clerks' office upon a different footing: but this would be only perpetuating an intolerable abuse. The Six Clerks' office ought to be abolished altogether, on account of its inutility and its expense; for instance, to take a bill off the file here, costs 60*l.* or 70*l.* and was often ruinous to the suitors. His learned friend objected to separating the jurisdiction in bankruptcy from the Great Seal. He (Mr. Taylor), however, was of opinion, that the bankruptcy business ought to be severed from the jurisdiction of the Great Seal; but if it were still to be kept attached to it, at all events, the grinding and oppressive fees connected with it, and which bore with such severity upon the unfortunate suitors, should be removed. He was further of opinion, that the numerous patent places connected with this establishment ought to be abolished. A commission should be opened by affidavit, and not by patent, and every thing possible ought to be done to reserve the property of a debtor for his creditors. Good God! was it to be borne, that when men had lost so much by misfortunes in trade; when those who had trusted and those who had been trusted were alike suffering,—was it to be borne, that the law should diminish the little remnant left, and plunge those who were so situated into beggary and ruin. While he was on this subject, he would advert to Mr. Vizard, whose appointment had been called in question, but which to him was a source of great satisfaction. He believed that that gentleman understood the business of bankruptcy, and was capable, both of effecting improvements in that department, and of suggesting to the Legislature what improvements ought to be looked to. For many reasons, he was opposed to the system of having political Chancellors. Amongst other evils, the political character of a Lord Chancellor, and the avocations consequent upon it, prevented his regular attendance in his Court. The Chancellor should be only a Judge of Appeal in the House of Lords. With regard to the manifest and enormous abuses which had so long prevailed in the Court of Chancery, he must say, that Lord Eldon might have removed and remedied many of them. Lord Lyndhurst should have reformed them, according to his own suggestions, but he failed. Lord Eldon presided in that Court for upwards of twenty years, with that vicious system in existence, and not a single beneficial alteration was effected by him. If those who had presided there had been unwilling to reform the abuses existing in that Court, it was the duty of the executive government to have pressed the important matter upon them, or to find some Lord Chancellor who had the will and ability to effect the remedy. He had long endeavoured to attract the attention of the Legislature to it, and his patience had been nearly exhausted with the numerous and various complaints which had reached him from many quarters, with regard to the evils produced by the abuses in the Court of Chancery. He had, during the course of some years, received an immense number of letters from different persons who had suffered from those abuses, soliciting him to bring their cases before Parliament for the purpose of obtaining redress; and from one individual, a lady residing near Bungay, he had lately received a communication, covering sixteen sides of letter-paper, filled with a detail of the wrongs which she had endured, owing to the existence of the present vicious system. If the House would but consider the misery and wretchedness which that Court had been the means of disseminating amongst thousands of families, they would see at once that, by reforming the system which existed there,—for he found fault, not with the Judge, but with the system, —they would confer the greatest benefit that Parliament could possibly confer upon the country. There had been, from time to time, much eloquence exhausted on this great question, but as yet not a single act of real reform had been effected. He was confident, looking to the past career of the noble and learned Lord who now presided over that Court, that he would not let the present Session of Parliament pass over without trying whether, by his own individual efforts, he might not be able to work the work of reformation; and that, if he found himself, by his own individual authority and power, unable to effect that good, he would come to Parliament for its assistance towards applying a fit remedy to such monstrous and crying evils. With regard to patent places in the Court of Chancery, if no other individual would take that matter in hand, he (Mr. M. A. Taylor) would certainly hereafter submit a motion to the House on the subject. Whoever might be Lord Chancellor, or whoever might be Minister, this he would say, that he would never abandon this question of reform in the Court of Chancery until he saw it carried. He concluded by again expressing his hopes, that the present Keeper of the Great Seal would bring his great and comprehensive mind to grapple with the important subject; and that, at no distant period, the manifold abuses in that Court would be completely removed; and, in that case, the public would no longer consider the Court as a curse, but regard it as a blessing, in its due administration of equitable relief.

Mr. *J. Williams* said, his chief objection to the proceedings of that night, and the night before, was, that there was no specific motion before the House for the improvement of the Court of Chancery. If it were true, as stated by his hon. and learned friend, the member for Durham, and as also stated by his hon. and learned friend, the member for Weymouth, that speeches had had their day, and that acts were now required, he feared that no benefit whatever would arise from the present conversation, as there was nothing in view, and no distinct proposition before the House. Indeed, the conversation had one disadvantage attending it,—viz. where so much was said, it might be supposed that something would be done; and in this case such a supposition would end only in disappointment. He could not help expressing his regret, therefore, that his hon. and learned friend, the member for Weymouth, should have thought fit to take so discursive a course, and that he did not bring forward a specific measure, calculated to meet and remove some, even the most minute parts of those evils with which he appeared to be so fully impressed, and described so forcibly, and in so much detail. He was sure, had his hon. and learned friend introduced any specific measure, that it would have been fairly and candidly discussed, more particularly as his hon. and learned friend had stated, that he looked upon the reform of the abuses of the Court of Chancery in no respect as a measure of party; but would lend his powerful assistance to any one who should introduce any measure of probable relief; and if such a bill should be brought forward, he had no doubt, whoever introduced it would derive great benefit from the experience and superior knowledge of his hon. and learned friend. It was not his intention to follow his hon. and learned friend in his observations on the abuses in the Master's Office, arising from the length of the reports, or into any one of the many heads of the discourse he had pronounced. He declined doing so; not because, like his hon. and learned friend, the member for Durham, he would not allow the merit of novelty to the speech of his hon. and learned friend, the member for Weymouth, but because it was wanting in any distinct proposition. Treating the subject generally, in his opinion, the fundamental objection to the Court of Chancery was, the nature and extent of its jurisdiction. That should be diminished, and given to other Courts better constituted, from which it had been improperly filched. In his opinion, this would be the only effectual reform; and he had no doubt his hon. and learned friend, the member for Weymouth, would give his assistance in carrying it into effect. For his satisfaction, therefore, it might be mentioned, that the Chief Justice of the King's Bench, and the Common Law Commissioners, had adopted the principle of relieving the suitors of the Court of Chancery, by withdrawing them from that Court to other tribunals, where justice could be obtained in a more easy and compendious, and in a cheaper manner. ["*Hear, hear,*" *from Sir E. B. Sugden*] His hon. and learned friend cheered him, and no wonder, for no one knew the abuses of the Court of Chancery better than he. He trusted, therefore, that he would agree to the propriety of restoring to the Courts of Common Law that part of the jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery, which should never have found its way to that Court. The Bill of Interpleader, lately introduced, was one step in that direction; and his hon. and learned friend would probably recollect, that the Law Commissioners recommended that, in cases of Injunction, the appeal should be made directly to a Common Law Court, instead of the Court of Chancery. He did not know what his hon. and learned friend would think of that, nor how he would bear it, that those very Commissioners dared, in their recommendations, even to tread on the sacred ground of legacies, which no man could have touched out of the Court of Chancery, as it was supposed, without sacrilege or something quite as bad. He had often found that the best way to draw the attention of the House to any subject, was, to mention some particular case bearing on the point, not much perplexed with details. He would, therefore, take leave to mention a case which had come within his own knowledge, in order to show the blessed effects of the joint jurisdiction of Law and Equity—the one trespassing on the other, and the combination of which had been designated "the consummation of human wisdom." This was the expression of Lord Kenyon, who practised in one Court, where he got all his money, and was then placed at the head of another. No wonder, then, that he should say, that this joint operation of law and equity was the consummation of human wisdom. Let the House see, however, how they operated in the case to which he was about to allude. In that case a person named Graddon, who was born in the county of York, died after having made a fortune of about 4,000*l.* or 5,000*l.* real and personal. The deceased left the possession of a house, which he had in town, to a female relation. Shortly after his death, however, a near, though an obscure relation of the deceased's, a common labourer in the fields, started up as a claimant, and was supposed to be entitled to the whole of the property left by the deceased; to the personality of the deceased as next of kin, and to the realty as heir-at-law. The Solicitor to whom this man made application knew, that as there was both real and personal property, proceedings must be taken both at law and in equity. The first step, however, which he took was favourable to the character of that Solicitor, who resides in the north. He offered the defendant to take 300*l.* for his client's whole claim, but this offer was refused, and proceedings commenced. A bill was filed in the Court of Chancery, not to determine whether the claimant was entitled to the property, but to determine whether it was necessary for the Common Law Courts to entertain that question. Examinations were taken, and the proceedings in equity carried to a considerable extent, and of course at considerable expense, until at length there was an issue, from Chancery to a Court of Common Law, to try whether the plaintiff was the next of kin to the deceased; and this issue went down to York to be tried. This was the mode of proceeding necessarily resorted to on account of the personal property, the plaintiff having to resort to the Common Law Courts, by an action of ejectment, to recover possession of the freehold property. The issue tried, in which the plaintiff was proved to have been the next of kin, also demonstrated him to be the heir-at-law, and in this particular case entitled to the realty. The trial which took place in York, however, to try the question as to whether the plaintiff was next of kin, was not sufficient. The action of ejectment was to be tried in London. The freehold premises being situated in London, the venue was laid there, or more properly in Middlesex. To prove the case, however, it was necessary to bring up some aged witnesses who had been examined in York (some of them above eighty years of age). Those witnesses were not brought up, and the result was, the plaintiff was foiled. On the first action of ejectment, there was a verdict against him, though on the trial which took place shortly before at York, the fact of the plaintiff's being next of kin to the deceased was proved by evidence as plain as the light at noon day, and he actually recovered the personal property, on the ground of his being next of kin to this party dying in London. Before the plaintiff absolutely got possession of the personal property, however, there was another step—a motion made before the Master of the Rolls for a new trial. After being fully argued, that motion was refused with costs, still the plaintiff's right to the little freehold property remained to be tried. A second action of ejectment was brought to recover possession of this property. The witnesses were then brought up from York,—the same evidence to the very tittle which went to establish the plaintiff's being next of kin in York was also produced in London to establish the fact of his being heir-at-law, but this was done at an expense of not less than 400*l.* or 500*l.* After all this expense, however, there was no resistance. His hon. and learned friend, the member for Malton, (Sir James Scarlett) who is not in the habit of starting away when he can set up any defence for his client, on that occasion offered no defence; and Lord Tenterden, who tried it, observed that it was the clearest case he ever heard. There was a verdict, of course, for the plaintiff. To recover possession of this small property, however, there were three trials at Common Law, besides the proceedings in Equity. After all was over, the costs came to be taxed in the Court of Equity, and the plaintiff not being able to pay the bill, his person was taken in attachment for the costs. He had no means whatever of support, and was as he had been informed that very day, existing either by the lowest species of labour, or upon charity. When the proceedings commenced, the property of the deceased was in the possession of the woman to whom he had already referred, but as she was making away with it, an application was made to the Court of Equity to appoint a receiver. An order was made to this effect, but no actual appointment took place. Whilst matters were thus pending, the plaintiff's Solicitor received intimation that this woman was carrying off the property in the night-time, and he repaired to the house, not to take possession of the property, but merely to give orders that locks should be put on the doors, and measures of that kind adopted to prevent the property from being surreptitiously disposed of. Would the House believe it, however, in a country which assumes to be governed by the perfection of law, that for this interference on the part of the plaintiff's Solicitor, an action of trespass was brought against him, which action went through all the preparatory proceedings until it was brought to issue, and it would have been tried, but that the Master of the Rolls said, that out of common decency, and for the credit of the country, he felt called upon to interpose, and to stay the trial by a perpetual injunction. Of the 4,000*l.*, however, which the plaintiff was entitled to recover upon the plainest proof, he never received one farthing; the woman who unjustly made the resistance to his claim, did not retain a farthing—all was spent in the joint expenses of Law and Equity. The defendant's Solicitors received about 2,000*l.* in the course of those offensive and defensive proceedings, which he would not then more properly characterize. The moral of this brief, and, he thought, instructive case, was this, that if the Court of Chancery had kept its claws off, and the parties had only had to try the plaintiff's claim at Common Law, the issue to try who was the next of kin of the deceased, would also have decided who was the heir-at-law, and all the subsequent proceedings would have been saved. By no ingenuity within an undivided jurisdiction of either law or equity, could such an enormous expense have been incurred, as took place in this particular case, by "the consummation of human wisdom," the joint operation of law and equity. Bad as the Court of Equity is, and profligate as are the expenses of proceedings in it, yet, if it had had undivided jurisdiction in the case to which he had alluded, it would have been impossible that the expenses should have been so large. The Master of the Rolls was so struck with the clearness of the case, and so impressed with the justice of the plaintiff's claim, that he gave the plaintiff's Counsel a week to find out whether there was any precedent by which he might at once declare the plaintiff's rights to the freehold house, and prevent the expense of the actions of ejectment, which were tried at Common Law. No such precedent, however, could be found. He complained, then, of the joint operation of the two systems of law and equity. They were both at work at the same time; and when a party got into certain hands, so devoutly and charitably disposed, by the operation of this joint system, the persons, to whom he need not more particularly allude, had a power such as he had been endeavouring to exemplify, by tracing its results in one particular case. Charybdis is bad enough; but to be in Scylla and in Charybdis at the same time, surpassed all that he ever remembered to have heard of, either in ancient or modern history. Even the poets had invented nothing so cruel. With Common Law on one side, and Equity at the other, the 4,000*l.*—the whole property—went for the benefit, of whom the House might easily guess; and this upon a refusal to get rid of the whole of the claim, and, of course, the proceedings upon a payment of 300*l.* The offer was rejected, the property torn to pieces; and neither the party who injuriously resisted the fair claimant, nor the other, who had the fair claim, had ever received one farthing benefit. Whatever might be the antiquity or the authority of the system which tolerated such a nuisance, it ought to be put an end to by the unanimous condemnation of all mankind. It was a disgrace to this House and an injury to its dignity, to allow such a system to exist. As to the facts of the case, he entertained no doubt of their correctness, for many of them came within his own knowledge and observation. It was only by revising and recasting the more objectionable parts of both these systems, that any good could be effected, rather than by allowing the one and the other by their joint operations to tear the client to pieces. The great evil was, that men were placed under the joint administration of Law and Equity, and he should hail with sincere satisfaction any measures calculated to bring back to the Courts of Law that jurisdiction which they were robbed of in former times. He utterly despaired, indeed, of any large, comprehensive reform in the Court of Chancery. Reform must come step by step; it could not come from mere speeches; but by directing attention to manifest and obvious grievances. From that quarter he saw the light coming. He hoped that a change would be effected by the introduction of successive bills, by which the interference of the Court of Chancery would be diminished, and application made to other Courts which are more open, easy, and compendious, and that to them would be given what is conceived to be the jurisdiction of the Court of Equity. He gave no opinion on the various points introduced by his hon. and learned friend. Men did not remember what occurred in a conversation, where there was no definite point. Mention had been made by his hon. and learned friend, of the noble and learned Lord now at the head of the Court of Chancery. He was the last man to deny that every public Minister, and every man placed at the head of a Court, was the proper subject of public discussion and public observation. If, therefore, his hon. and learned friend, speaking manfully and fairly, as it is the undoubted privilege of every Member of Parliament to do, had merely commented on the fitness of that noble and learned Lord, there would have been no ground for complaint. But if it was intended by his hon. and learned friend to doubt the capacity of that noble and learned Lord for the situation which he now fills, he, who had sat side by side with that noble Lord for many years—for a greater time than it would be convenient for either to remember—would take leave to say, that those who had seen him only in this House, were unacquainted with his Herculean powers of labour and stupendous industry, which extended over a space of which few had any idea; and he had no doubt, if that noble and learned Lord were allowed to remain in his present position for only a reasonable time, either he would die under his exertions, or he would make himself a most accomplished magistrate to preside in that Court; and, as a mere lawyer is a poor sort of thing without other accomplishments, he would be rendered, by means of his great capacity, and the variety of his attainments, an ornament even to that high station in which he had, at length, been placed. As the Judge of the Equity side of the Court of Exchequer had been alluded to, without any disrespect to the learned Lord now sitting in that Court, he might take the opportunity of saying, that it had caused the greatest disappointment in the profession, to learn that there was no likelihood of another noble and learned Lord being elevated, if it could be so called, to the head of that Court. In his opinion, that noble and learned Lord was the fittest man in the country to be placed at the head of the Court of Exchequer. His hon. and learned friend had talked of making the Equity side of the Court of Exchequer effective; but, meaning no disrespect to the very venerable and learned person who presided in that Court, he must say, that the placing the noble and learned Lord alluded to at the head of it, would do more in twelve months to render it effective than could be done by any other measures in as many years. He had practised under that noble and learned Lord, and he had no hesitation in saying, that when the judicial talents of that noble and learned Lord were enlarged by practice, the consequence of his elevation would be, the highest popularity to his Court, and the business of suitors would flow into it, and the result would be of greater importance in equalizing the general business of the Courts than any Act of Parliament which could be framed for that purpose could effect. In conclusion he begged to remark that he felt great disappointment at the speech of his hon. and learned friend, the member for Weymouth, on finding that the hon. Member had confined himself to making remarks on the nature of the abuses in the Courts of Equity, and on their remedy, on which remarks no practical result had been founded or proposed.

Mr. *Spence* confessed, that he had heard the speech of his hon. and learned friend, who had just sat down, with a great deal of surprise. He remembered the hon. Member's speech on the same subject last year, when he was one of the most strenuous supporters of the proposition for the appointment of a new Equity Judge, it seemed extraordinary, therefore, that he should now propose that the greater part, if not the whole, of the business should be removed from the Equity Courts to the Courts of Common Law. His hon. and learned friend found fault with his hon. and learned friend, the member for Weymouth, for not bringing forward any distinct question, and proposed to remove the business of Courts of Equity to his own Court. Instead, however, of shewing that any part of the business of the Court of Chancery could be disposed of in a more cheap, easy, and compendious manner in the Courts of Common Law, his hon. and learned friend had laboured to shew, that both jurisdictions were equally objectionable. [Mr. *John Williams* said, he did not say that.] That was the necessary inference from what his learned friend did say; that was the moral which every one must have drawn from it;—every one who did not know the hon. Member's purpose must have supposed that his hon. and learned friend was going to propose some sweeping measure for abolishing the jurisdiction of the Courts of Law and Equity. His learned friend would, therefore, excuse his further entering into the question of removing the Equity business to Courts of Law, and of attempting to reconcile such a proposition with the sentiments uttered by his hon. and learned friend last Session. He meant to address himself to the question—"can we reform the Court of Chancery, by removing or diminishing the existing abuses?" In his humble opinion, they could. He regretted, that instead of the Motion before the House, the speech of the hon. and learned Mover was not followed by a motion for leave to bring in a bill, for, had it been, he was confident he would have had the whole of the House, and the discussion of this subject would not have ended in a splash, as was said the other night by the hon. Member for Middlesex. Mr. Spence proceeded to state, that in his judgment, the House of Commons must take upon itself to reform the Court of Chancery; he could not agree in the opinion, that the Government must originate such a measure. Looking back historically, he observed that nothing effectual had been done by any Government on this subject. The complaints against the Court of Chancery began almost as soon as it became a Court for the administration of justice. Some few nights ago, he moved for certain returns, which would shew what were the complaints against that Court in the reign of Elizabeth. In 1743, those complaints were renewed in this House, which referred them to the consideration of a Select Committee, and that Committee made a report, and came to certain resolutions; one of which, namely, that which related to the exactions of the officers, pointed out the nature of the evil, and of the remedy to be applied, more effectually than any thing that had since been proposed in the House or out of it. A commission was at that time appointed by the Government to inquire into the subject, and a report was made, but it led to nothing effectual, either on the part of the House, or the Administration. Lord Hardwicke, however, issued certain orders, in which he established regulated fees, and endeavoured to extinguish gratuities, expedition-money, and other evils; all of which, however, had continued down to the present hour, accumulating in pressure upon the suitor till they had become intolerable. All this was because the House of Commons left the remedy to the Government, which, from the multiplicity of its duties, could not possibly have time to attend to it. Every Chancellor, and every person who held office under his Majesty, must have such numerous objects to divert their attention, that it ought not to be expected that they could, without assistance, establish any measures for so great a reform as was required. Every Member of the House must give his mite of earnest assistance—he must furnish them with details, he must himself bring forward propositions; for if this were not done, the country would never see a reform of the Court of Chancery. The orders of Lord Hardwicke would give an instance of this. His order was, that a party should be at liberty to take a copy of so much only of a report as he might require: this had been superseded. Lord Hardwicke also expressly declared that no expedition-money should be taken; but expedition-money was taken in almost every office of the Court, under the name of "the stationer's charge." He trusted that, in future, the suitors would not have to rely only on the ill-attended-to orders of Judges, but that the House would adopt resolutions so clear and precise, that not even a Judge should be able to overturn them. Whoever might be the Chancellor, if the Legislature did not watch over him, it would be utterly impossible that, in the multiplicity of his business, abuses should not escape him. He humbly hoped, therefore, that in future, looking to past experience, the House would take care not to trust to orders, but would superintend the Court of Chancery itself. In 1813 there was a commission, and the Commissioners, in their report, exposed a great number of abuses—expedition-money and gratuities, among others; yet nothing had been done to this hour to get rid of those abuses, which prevailed to such an extent, as to make it imperative upon the House to step in to reform the Court. With regard also to useless offices, the report he had first attended to, stated, that they were a great evil. It was only necessary to turn over a few pages of the valuable document, lately laid before the House, for which it was indebted to the right hon. Gentleman on his left, (Sir James Graham) and the House would find one person holding three sinecure offices, yielding 240*l.*, 1,816*l.*, and 553*l.* per annum respectively. Turn over to the next page, and again they found one person enjoying three sinecure offices, yielding salaries amounting, in the aggregate, to upwards of 9,000*l.* a-year; and these offices were granted he understood, in reversion. What then was the use of the investigations in 1732? What was the use of the commissions twelve years later? What was the use of all the subsequent inquiries, since the evil had increased to such an enormous extent? He called the particular attention of the House to the gross abuse that prevailed with regard to the patentee for the execution of the Statutes respecting bankrupts. His emoluments came out of the dividends of bankrupts' estates, thereby still further diminishing the small amount of his debt the creditor had to receive. The year 1825 was one of extensive distress; but how must the patentee have rejoiced at it, for it raised his emoluments from 8,000*l.* to 13,000*l.*! He said, therefore, that some measures must be instantly taken, more powerful and more efficient than any that had been had recourse to, and such could only be taken by the House. There was such a vast field of matter before him, that he was afraid of fatiguing the House by entering upon it; but he would, as cursorily as possible, go through the prominent topics which had been so ably urged by his learned friend, on the preceding evening, adding illustrations to those points in which he entirely agreed with him, stating very shortly where he disagreed with him, and also adverting to those points in which his propositions ought to be extended. First, then, with regard to the important subject of the Registrars' Office. The expense of decrees could only, at present, be judged of from the evidence taken before the Chancery Commissioners; but the returns he had moved for in April last, would, when produced, shew it in its true light. At present, referring to the evidence of Mr. Vizard, Secretary of Bankrupts to the present Chancellor, we find, that in one instance, 60*l.* was paid for a decree, of which nine-tenths was for recitals. It might be instructive to inquire what were the fees received by the Registrars in 1797, many years after 1732, when the House of Commons thought the enormity of the fees in the different offices called for parliamentary inquiry. In 1797, as appeared by the report of the committee on Finance, in the thirteenth volume of the Reports of the House of Commons, the senior Registrar received 1124*l.* a-year; and the whole sum received by the Registrars at that time, which was thought very exorbitant, was 4847*l.* 9*s.* Hon. Members, not conversant with the subject, would be utterly astonished when he told them that the senior Registrar, now received more than all the Registrars put together in 1797—namely, 4861*l.*; and the sum of all the receipts of all the Registrars and deputy Registrars, and chief Clerks in the office, now amounted to 21,601*l.* Upon the evidence before the House, it was clear those who practised in the Courts knew it without such evidence—that every decree, except one of dismissal, was filled with pleadings, in order to swell the demand made for it. But hon. Members might say, perhaps, these recitals must be of some use. They were of none—they were utterly useless; and if Counsel were to quote a recital in a decree, he would be told, and properly told, by the opposite Counsel, that they would not be bound by that statement, and he must produce the original bill or answer. But let the House look to the evidence of Mr. Walker, the Registrar himself, when examined by the Commissioners. He was asked,—"Do you who sit in Court and hear the cause, point out what recitals are to be made in the decree?"—"No; I have too much to do."—"Who does it?"—and his answer was, "Why, I leave it to a clerk," and he, no doubt, puts in just as much as he thought the cause could well afford to pay; so that, if the cause would afford it, the decree was stuffed with recitals. Any hon. Member who would look at the evidence taken before the Chancery Commissioners, would find that this was the regular system; nay more, that the abuse of those recitals was not confined to payment for the original decree; for, after getting the order, which was to be embodied in the decree, and after waiting two months for it, the Registrar sends you to a clerk for the decree: who tells you you must wait a month or six weeks; and if you say you want it immediately, it is of no avail; but if you say that you want two copies, perhaps it will be produced the next morning. That was the evidence of Solicitors themselves, to be found in the document to which he had before referred. These abuses had grown up in consequence of these abominable recitals; for if they were not in the decree, the clerk could not say to the Solicitor, it would take him a month to draw it up; and if it were confined to the ordering part, the Solicitor could get it, as in a Court of Common Law, the next morning. The next subject was one of great importance—that of the Masters' Office; and with the permission of the House he would make the same comparison, with regard to the fees received by the Masters and their clerks in 1797 and 1830, as he did with regard to the Registrars. Taking all the receipts of the Masters in 1797, it made a sum of 13,664*l.* The clerks of the Masters received more in 1830 than the whole amount of what the Masters received in 1797,—namely, 13,852*l.* besides 5,143*l.* to junior clerks; whilst the Masters themselves received no less than 39,043*l.*, being an excess of more than 40,000*l.* a-year. In the Report Office, the Master—who had a mere sinecure place, for his clerk did all the duties, and who, in 1798, had 1,069*l.* a-year, in 1830 had 4,589*l.* The Masters obtained these enormous emoluments from the system of taking office copies from them; and having ascertained that to be the abuse, the House would know how to apply the remedy, which was not precisely that which had been suggested by his hon. and learned friend. It would be best, he thought, for the Solicitors mutually to hand over copies, and his hon. friend would find, on referring to the Chancery report, or the report on copies made in 1828, that two of the Masters agreed in that suggestion. At present all the cost for copies was clear outlay by the Solicitors in the Masters' Office; and during the whole time the case was in the Masters' Office, the plaintiff's and defendant's Solicitors were put to the expense of taking these copies, without the slightest remuneration, till the costs were paid, and it might happen that the case would stay in the Masters' Office two, three, four, and even six years. The Solicitor must be remunerated for this outlay, which was done by the objectionable system of warrants, for every one of which he got a certain sum. But if the plaintiff were to hand over his copy to the defendant, and was paid for that copy as at Common Law, and the defendant, on the other hand were to do the same to the plaintiff, the Solicitor would not be at so great an outlay, and would be remunerated by the charge for copies, and, consequently, would not be obliged to have recourse to extraordinary means of reimbursement. It was, too, by no means necessary that these fees should be taken by the Masters, in order to give them an adequate salary: for the amount of their lawful fees (he being unable to ascertain how the Masters acquired the right to demand these fees for copies, as in the Statute of Charles 2nd, defining the fees to be taken by the Masters, they are not mentioned,) appears, by the return of the emoluments of one of the Masters, to be 1,377*l.* It would be better, he thought, to revive that Statute, and declare that the Masters should receive those fees, and those only; and to increase some of them, if necessary, so as to raise their incomes to 2,000*l.* That sum had already been fixed upon by the Legislature as the utmost amount of salary for a Master in the Court of Exchequer, and he conceived it was sufficient for the duties of the office. We should then have men appointed from those ranks at the Bar where you would find them most competent to fill the office, as it would not be worth while to fill it for an indirect or political purpose, and it would be requisite, too, that it should be filled by a really working man. He next came to a subject of paramount importance, though he knew not whether an humble individual like himself ought to originate such a proposition, but he confessed, looking to the absolute necessity of a reform in the administration of justice in the Court of Chancery, that he felt compelled by duty to state his opinion, which was this: that until the Lord Chancellor shall be remunerated by a salary, instead of fees, it would be utterly impossible to carry the proposed reforms into every branch of the Court. On recollection, he found that such a suggestion had not originated with him. The committee appointed at the instance of his indefatigable friend, the member for Durham, reported that the Chancellor's emoluments were to a great extent made up of fees, which were apportioned between him and his officers, and gave an opinion, that it was inexpedient that such a practice should continue. If any hon. Gentleman would take the trouble to look at the returns presented to the House, he would see that, in some instances, the Chancellor received emoluments in petty driblets, and in others from most objectionable sources. He should no longer be the only Judge in the land upon whom could rest the imputation of receiving improper fees. It should be recollected, that the Chief Justices of the Courts of Common Law, the Master of the Rolls, and all the Judges, had had whatever fees they were entitled to, commuted for a regular salary. When it was known that the income of the Chancellor, derived from these exceptionable sources, only amounted to the income of the Chief Justice, it seemed very improper that the chief law-officer of the country should be placed in a worse situation than the Chief Justice. If that reform were accomplished, there might be a substantial reform in bankruptcy, but it would not be practicable to abolish recitals or decrees in causes, and keep them in orders in bankruptcy. It would be difficult to do it in either case, if measures were not introduced to do away with the practice of the Chancellor dividing fees with his Secretary. If that practice were abolished, orders in bankruptcy might be written on the petitions. Let him remind the House, that in 1797, the fees of the Secretary in Bankruptcy amounted to about 1,100*l.*, of which 500*l.* went to pay the expense of clerks, the other 600*l.* being his income. Now his receipts were 10,000*l.* a-year, of which about 4,000*l.* went to the Chancellor. This was a subject of vast importance, and he rather threw it out for consideration than made any proposition upon it. He trusted that the House would give him credit for his motives in making this suggestion, for he did not know whether the alteration would be gratifying to the Chancellor or not, but he felt so strongly on the subject, that he could not forbear bringing it before the House for consideration. Before proceeding further, he wished to correct an error, unintentional no doubt, into which his hon. friend had fallen with regard to the office of the Accountant-general, which ought to be regulated, and he would state why. It appeared by the Returns, that the Accountant-general received a part of the brokerage; his learned friend did not object to that, but did he not object to the broker receiving 1,848*l.* per annum? for that was his share in 1828. Now, he would propose, that what had been done in Ireland should be done here,—namely, that the Chancellor should appoint a broker, and no doubt a man of the utmost respectability might be found who would undertake the office for 1,000*l.* a-year. His learned friend did not object to the salary of the Accountant-general as such, but it should be remembered, that with what he received as Master, his income was 4,452*l.*, which was too much by at least 1,500*l.* With regard to the Six-Clerks'-office, the evidence of Mr. Vizard, so often referred to, had convinced him that the incalculable evils which arose from it could only be got rid of by its utter abolition. He confessed that when he heard Mr. Vizard was appointed the Lord Chancellor's Secretary, he thought it was a good omen of an effectual reform in the Court of Chancery. If he had been asked what man he would select as most proper to be about the Chancellor at the present moment, when he had to reform the Court, he should have said, by all means take Mr. Vizard. The Chancery Commissioners were certainly against the abolition of this office; the reason they gave for it was, that it was proper that there should be a body of practitioners kept up acquainted with the practice of the Court, by which it might be maintained in a uniform state. The Clerks in this Court received about 9,000*l.* a-year for copies, 3,000*l.* of which would be saved if copies were mutually handed over by the Solicitors, as he proposed in the case of the Masters' Office. These copies, besides, are made in the most inconvenient form, often as thick as the box on the Table, with a few words,—indeed, in some cases, with no more than two words all down a page. This was perfectly monstrous, and those copies, which cost so much were all sent to the chandler's shop as waste paper. What was extraordinary, too, although the client paid a clerk for an office-copy, if he made any mistakes, such as leaving out a sentence, putting the party to great expense, the Court refused a remedy: so that, although they were paid for as perfect copies, no warranty was given with them, and great expense was often occasioned by their imperfections. But to return to the question as to the practice. There was no complaint of an attorney not knowing the practice in the Courts of Common Law, but in those Courts there were no clerks on whom to rely for the practice; the Attorneys learn it, therefore; and although they might make mistakes, there was no Attorney in a Court of Common Law who would not be ashamed of not knowing the practice of his Court, but a Solicitor never pretended to know the practice of the Courts of Equity; he sent to the Clerk in Court, and, the practice being confined to the breasts of those persons, the Solicitors could not learn what it was. He could point out many instances where the Clerks in Court had differed as to what the practice is, and as they never went into Court, how could they learn it? At one time they used to be allowed a fee for attendance every time a cause was heard, but, as they never did attend, the commissioners struck off that shameless charge, and they were now allowed only for one attendance. Surely, the practice ought to be laid down by the Judge, but here the proper order of things was absolutely reversed, and the Judge had to learn the practice from the officers of the Court, instead of himself declaring what the rules of practice were. That was a perfect absurdity? He would rather take the suggestions of his learned friend, than of the commissioners, on this point. He said, that the orders of the Court regulated the practice, from the time of Lord Bacon downwards; but it was extraordinary that when one Judge had made a substantive set of orders, he had never recited those of his predecessors, or noticed them in any way, leaving it to the practitioners to find out what orders were in force and what not, and that down to the last set made out by the late Lord Chancellor. He should say, therefore, let the Judges of the Equity Courts meet together, re-frame the orders of different periods, and settle the practice generally, and thus prepare a document to which the Solicitor might refer to know how he was to proceed in a cause. But it was more singular in the present practice that no one Clerk in Court is an authorized organ for fixing the practice; and, each solicitor going to some one clerk, there was often a clashing of opinion. Only a few days ago a creditor to a small amount was turned round upon a point of practice, and made to pay costs four times the amount of his claims when he would defy any human being to say beforehand what the practice was. There was occasionally a decision in practice, and, by dint of great labour, a man might pick out from the reported cases what the practice was to a small extent. A few days ago he wished to inform a client upon a point of practice, and turned to Mr. Grant's very able book, the last upon that subject, to see what he had said upon it, when, to his utter dismay, after detailing what the practice formerly was, he went on to say —" The above is stated for information; but how far the new rules have altered the practice, or reversed it, or abolished it, it is impossible for any person, on such a point as this to say; it must be left to the decision of the Court."—Thus a Solicitor who wrote a book on the subject, said, it was impossible to tell what the practice is. There was then a vital disease in the practice of the Court, which could be completely remedied only by abolishing the present system altogether. The Six Clerks'-office was also preserved for the purpose of taxing costs; but he had documents in his hand which completely illustrated their inability to discharge even that duty. He held in his hand a bill of costs, thirty-five sheets long, which was taxed in the Masters' office, in the presence of a Clerk in Court. The bill amounted to 830*l*., from which, upon taxation, 132*l*. was struck off; but afterwards the Solicitor himself retaxed the costs without the Clerk in Court, and took off twice the amount. It might be asked how this happened? Why the Clerk in Court allowed for a copy of ninety folios, when it contained only fifty-one; and for another, 1,150, which contained only 779, and committed other oversights, of a similar nature, although he was one of the most intelligent of the body. The fees, too, which they received were very heavy. He had known a case in which they had received as much as 60*l*. from each side, and as the Solicitors received the same, it made an expense of 120*l*. on each side for taxing the costs alone. The Six Clerks themselves had, in effect, sinecures; for they divided the duty between them by taking two months each in the year, for which two months of doing nothing, each, with other small fees, as Comptroller of the Hanaper, received 1,200*l*. a-year. He said, two months of doing nothing; and hon. Members would agree with him, if they would take the pains to look at the evidence of Mr. Vizard, or of the Six Clerks, which describes the duties of the office; and they might be discharged by any man of the least glimmering of understanding, for they consisted in seeing that the documents were written in a fair hand on proper parchment, and not blotted, and other similar duties. He did not mean to treat the individuals in that office with any disrespect, but he certainly did not think them competent to the office of taxing costs, as suggested by his hon. and learned friend. There was, he feared, no alternative but to employ one or two taxing officers, and he would pay them as he would every one who did anything beneficial to the suitor, while he would get rid of all offices not beneficial to the suitor. He would then proceed to the last subject on which he should trouble the House. Having got rid of the Six Clerks, an office must be erected to keep the Records; and, connected with this subject, he had framed a plan which would as he thought get rid of three-fourths of the abuses existing in the Court of Chancery. He proposed, that all bills should be filed in the office so erected, not written, as now, on a great sheet of parchment, which nobody could read, but in the form of a book. Next to the bills, the answers should be entered in the same way. Then should come the decree, the report, the order, or further directions, all following one another in the same way. This would totally abolish the present expensive system of recitals. At present the decree was carried to one office, the report to another, and the bill and answer to another, so that each document contained a recital of all the proceedings necessary to explain it; but if they were all entered one after another, like sheets in a book, there would be no necessity for a recital, for the report would be explained by the decree which preceded it, as would the order on further directions by the report. He would ask any individual who had ever seen the records of the Courts of Chancery, the immense sheets of parchment, covered, certainly with writing in a legible hand, but he defied any man to read them without a guide for the eye;—he would ask any individual, who had seen these records, whether the plan he proposed would not be a simple, but vast improvement? It would at once put an end to the multiplied copies of the same document—multiplied, indeed, to an extent hardly conceivable; for it often happened, that the same sentences were written ten times over in the different offices. It would abolish, also, the Enrolment Office; for, not content with all the previous copies for decrees, in order to get the benefit of his decree, a party must have it enrolled —that is, have it written on a long musty sheet of parchment, and laid by. The gentleman to whom he was indebted for many of these details, Mr. Edgar Taylor, had published a pamphlet on the subject, to which all interested in it might refer with great advantage. That gentleman shewed, that the pleadings were copied six times over at least: a Writ of Execution, must contain the order, with all its recitals; and what was most monstrous, although the party succeeding was compelled to obtain a Writ of Execution to enforce his decree, yet he was not allowed it in his costs. Indeed, he must say, that a complete revision of the present system of costs was necessary. He had trespassed longer on the time of hon. Members than he intended; but he thanked the House most cordially for its kind indulgence. He should not have entered so much into detail, had he not, early in the Session, given notice of a series of resolutions which embody the opinions he had expressed. It was certainly his intention to take the opinion of the House on those resolutions, unless something effectual should in the interim be brought forward in this or the other House; and he had only delayed the subject till after Easter, from a feeling that he could not fairly press it upon the attention of Ministers whilst they had so many things to attend to. He was sure his Majesty's Government would not consider that it was in the slightest spirit of hostility to them that he had formed this resolution, but he had been grievously disappointed by trusting to other Governments, and felt it necessary, therefore, not to depend too much upon this Government. He had the most perfect conviction that the Court of Chancery might be rendered a Court in the highest degree beneficial to the subject, and he believed that, if the alteration of the hon. member for Winchelsea were adopted, of transferring its jurisdiction to the Common Law Courts, of which he says they have been robbed, we should soon find them more encumbered than the Court of Chancery itself. Let the House keep the Courts of Common Law free from the reproach of delay, expense, and vexation, and endeavour to make such alterations as would relieve the Court of Chancery from such imputations, and then the House would not have to discuss such bills as that brought before it for forcing parties to submit their cases to the arbitration of any individual the Judge may think fit to appoint. That he should decidedly object to: for it would be in effect to deny a man that justice the Constitution of the land entitled him to demand, and would be for Parliament to declare itself incompetent to establish a sufficient Court of Judicature.

Sir *E. B. Sugden* submitted that the debate should be adjourned.

Mr. *R. Grant* was ready to acquiesce in the adjournment; but he thought Members must feel how much more advantageous it would be to deliver their opinions when there was some substantive proposition before the House, and not on conversation leading to nothing. He did not conceive it was regular to adjourn, for the second time, on an unresisted motion.

Mr. *Campbell* merely rose to protest against the doctrine of his hon. and learned friend (Sir E. B. Sugden), that a member of the Common Law Bar could not make a competent Lord Chancellor. This was saying, that to spend twenty years in an equity draughtsman's office, was the best education for a Lord Chancellor, a proposition which he could never acquiesce in. He had the authority of Lord Eldon for saying, that the best Chancellors were those that had been taken from the Common Law Bar. That learned Lord himself went the northern circuit. Sir Samuel Romilly practised at Sessions sixteen or seventeen years, and he believed that the most eminent Equity lawyers had received the best part of their education at the Common Law Bar.

The gallery was cleared for a division on the question of adjournment; but there not being forty Members present, the House adjourned of course.

END OF VOL. I.—THIRD SERIES.

T. C. Hansard, Printer,
32, Paternoster-row, London.

INDEX

TO VOL. I.

THIRD SERIES.

MEMBERS WHO HAVE SPOKEN IN DEBATE:—

HOUSE OF LORDS.

ABERDEEN, Earl of, (Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), 247
Anglesea, Marquis of, 421, 422

Bathurst, Earl, 559
Bute, the Marquis of, 11, 263, 1114, 1294

Calthorpe, Lord, 1295
Camden, Marquis of, 21, 424
Canterbury, Archbishop of, 1112
Carberry, Lord, 380, 422, 684, 707
Carnarvon, Earl of, 618, 651, 887
Chancellor, the Lord, (Lord Lyndhurst), 61, 500
———————— (Lord Brougham), 673, 676, 680, 701, 707, 760, 768, 818, 823, 966, 1117, 1204, 1296, 1341, 1345
Clanrickarde, Marquis of, 254, 369, 421, 961
Cleveland, Marquis of, 316
Clifden, Lord Viscount, 816

Darnley, Earl of, 24, 422, 425, 888, 1199, 1295
Downshire, Marquis of, 422
Duncan, Lord, 1292, 1295, 1339
Durham, Lord, 493, 500, (Lord Privy Seal), 665

Eldon, Earl of, 509, 678, 681, 849, 869, 876, 1344
Ellenborough, Lord, 1292

Falmouth, Earl of, 317, 682
Farnham, Lord, 26, 816, 1038, 1202
Fife, Earl of, 884, 1294

Goderich, Lord Viscount, (Secretary of State for the Colonies), 1040, 1347, 1349
Gort, Lord Viscount, 380
Gosford, Earl of, 1041
Grey, Earl, 28, 256, (First Lord of the Treasury), 606, 613, 617, 676, 690, 755, 876, 894, 1032, 1038, 1116, 1293, 1345
Grosvenor, Earl, 559, 672, 706, 1023, 1041

Haddington, Earl of, 1291, 1293
Hamilton, Duke of, 1182

King, Lord, 368, 665, 851, 959, 960, 1109, 1114, 1201, 1203, 1290, 1293, 1294

Lansdown, Marquis of, 245, 422, (Lord President of the Council), 604, 613, 1028, 1204, 1205
Leinster, Duke of, 25
London, Bishop of, 1112
Londonderry, Marquis of, 247, 249, 370
Lyndhurst, Lord, 667, 739, 763

Melbourne, Viscount, (Secretary of State for the Home Department), 821, 822
Monson, Lord, 18

Napier, Lord, 691, 964
Newcastle, Duke of, 750, 759, 763, 884
Norwich, Bishop of, 707

Ormonde, the Marquis of, 816

Radnor, Earl of, 261, 365, 612, 614, 869, 957
Richmond, Duke of, 22, 248, 249, 376, 382, 423, (Postmaster General), 886, 894
Rosebery, Earl of, 845, 868, 1338
Rosslyn, Earl of, 497, 894

Salisbury, Marquis of, 382, 603, 687
Shrewsbury, Earl of, 253
Stanhope, Earl, 858, 887, 959, 965, 1339
Stourton, Lord, 378, 889
Suffield, Lord, 373, 376, 495, 499, 603, 1205

Tenterden, Lord, (Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench), 499, 571, 701
Teynham, Lord, 370, 376, 378, 424, 884, 1345, 1348

Wellington, Duke of, (First Lord of the Treasury), 44, 199, 250, 260, 317, 366, 381, 558, (out of office), 682, 822, 824, 873, 958, 960, 1030

Wharncliffe, Lord, 370, 614, 963, 1115

Winchilsea, Earl of, 18, 195, 199, 371, 381, 683, 856, 961

Wynford, Lord, 557, 572, 675, 681, 691, 702, 828, 891, 894, 1349

MEMBERS WHO HAVE SPOKEN IN DEBATE:—
HOUSE OF COMMONS.

ACHESON, Lord, 768

Acland, Sir Thomas D., 827

Althorp, Lord Viscount, 61, 266, 298, 327, 334, 444, 489, 543, 562, 564, (subsequently Chancellor of the Exchequer) 797, 798, 800, 808, 812, 928, 932, 936, 937, 950, 954, 981, 983, 988, 995, 997, 1004, 1020, 1021, 1064, 1068, 1070, 1072, 1074, 1086, 1089, 1092, 1102, 1108, 1132, 1164, 1187, 1196, 1227

Arbuthnot, Right Hon. Charles, 211, 266

Attorney General (Sir James Scarlett), 468, 595. (Sir Thomas Denman) 741, 954, 956, 996, 1107, 1175, 1210, 1265, 1286

Attwood, Matthias, Mr., 1068, 1100, 1103, 1167, 1368

Baillie, Colonel James Evan, 1354

Bankes, Mr., 540, 801, 936, 953, 1230

Bankes, George, Mr., 950, 1232, 1369

Baring, Mr., 223, 231, 632, 634, 782

Baring, Francis, Mr., 1121

Bateson, Sir Robert, 321, 586, 587, 658, 662, 827, 975, 1017, 1020, 1022, 1072, 1307

Beaumont, Thomas Wm., Mr., 211, 352, 353

Belgrave, Lord Viscount, 385, 1045

Bell, Matthew, Mr., 427, 510

Benett, John, Mr., 426, 428, 582

Bentinck, Lord George, 1080

Beresford, Lord George, 398, 583

Bernal, Ralph, Mr., 214, 314, 651, 1056

Bethell, Richard, Mr., 650

Blandford, the Marquis of, 64, 896, 1337

Bourke, Sir John, 155, 216, 407, 592, 703, 774, 790, 1017

Boyle, Lord Viscount, 408

Briscoe, John, Mr., 338, 597, 651, 810, 1001, 1049, 1103, 1106, 1124, 1319

Brougham, Henry, Mr., 6, 54, 105, 132, 181, 193, 265, 266, 274, 296, 330, 331, 359, 362, 363, 454, 464, 548, 562, 567, 589, 590

Browne, Dominick, Mr., 575

Brownlow, Charles, Mr., 319, 414, 768, 827

Bruce, Michael, Mr., 363

Brydges, Sir John W., 524

Buller, James W., Mr., 1121

Burdett, Sir Francis, 944, 1179, 1192, 1204

Burrel, Sir Charles, 265, 349

Burrell, William, Mr., 348

Buxton, Thomas Fowel, Mr., 1058

Byng, George, Mr., 580

Calcraft, Right Hon. John, 541, 827, 949, 1192, 1194

Calvert, Nicholson, Mr., 4, 140, 809

Campbell, John, Mr., 344, 347, 361, 488, 582, 628, 672, 742, 746, 956, 1107, 1195, 1233, 1262, 1266

Carrington, Sir Edmond, 567

Cavendish, Lord George A. H., 629

Chancellor of the Exchequer (Right Hon. Henry Goulburn), 139, 140, 228, 242, 289, 364, 427, 429, 531

Chandos, Marquis of, 513, 582, 1047, 1121, 1214, 1232

Chichester, Sir Arthur, 589, 1316

Clerk, Sir George, 672, 804, 1082, 1363

Clive, Edward B., Mr., 1042, 1043, 1122, 1218

Colborne, N. White Ridley, Mr., 599, 672, 807, 951

Cornewall, Frederick Hamilton, Mr., 993

Courtenay, Right Hon. Thomas P., 477, 671, 801, 1021, 1080, 1331, 1368

Cradock, Hon. Lieut.-Colonel John H., 1185

Cripps, Joseph, Mr., 163

Croker, Right Hon. John W., 211, 637, 644, 649, 801, 953

Curteis, Edward Herbert, Mr., 105, 349, 582, 598, 628, 789, 793, 811, 815, 1316, 1326, 1332, 1336

Davies, Colonel Thomas H. H., 132, 214, 221, 278, 631, 635

Davis, Richard Hart, Mr., 174, 1352

Dawson, Alexander, Mr., 398

Dawson, Right Hon. George R., 319, 328, 781, 782, 798, 929, 936, 1370, 1398

Denison, William Joseph, Mr., 520, 1105, 1207

Denman, Thomas, Mr., 169, 294, 590, 627, 629, (see Attorney General)

Doherty, John, Mr., (Solicitor General for Ireland), 129, 210, 235, 318, 388, 487, 593

Douglass, William R. Keith, Mr., 309, 471, 943, 1050, 1062

Dugdale, Dugdale S., Mr., 1305
Duncombe, Arthur, Mr., 1042, 1043, 1120, 1121, 1228
Duncombe, Hon. William, 813, 1086, 1330
Dundas, Robert Adam, Mr., 57, 265
Dundas, Right Hon. William, 516, 517, 518, 1186

East, Sir Edward Hyde, 2
Eastnor, Lord Viscount, 146
Ebrington, Lord Viscount, 573
Ellice, Edward, Mr., 1121, 1122
Evans, William, Mr., 651, 1364
Ewart, Mr., 1017, 1180, 1351

Ferguson, Robert Cutlar Mr., 137, 160, 202, 519, 597, 778, 792, 805, 956, 985, 996, 997, 1107, 1125, 1310, 1311
Ferguson, Sir Ronald C., 515, 627
Fitzgerald, Right Hon. Maurice, 120, 913
Forbes, Sir Charles, 293, 518
Freshfield, James, Mr., 1265
Fyler, Thomas B., Mr., 810, 999

Gascoyne, General, 428, 650, 826, 982, 1123, 1180, 1182, 1351
Gilbert, Davies Giddy, Mr., 1163
Gordon, Robert, Mr., 428, 1021, 1071, 1087 1009
Gore, Wm. Ormsby, Mr., 788, 826
Goulburn, Right Hon. Henry (see Chancellor of the Exchequer), 574, 670, 706, 741, 779, 795, 802, 946, 951, 952, 995, 1216, 1217
Gower, Lord Francis L., 173, 245, 403, 644, 649
Graham, Sir James, 290, 353, 364, 517, 570, (First Lord of the Admiralty), 1316, 1370, 1374, 1398
Grant, Right Hon. Charles, 312
Grant, Right Hon. Robert, 427, 985, 1078, 1181, 1185
Grattan, James, Mr., 330, 402, 410, 593, 922
Greene, Thomas, Mr., 1304
Gresley, Sir Roger, 168
Grimstone, Lord, 55
Gurney, Hudson, Mr., 661, 1166, 1191

Hardinge, Right Hon. Sir Henry, 123, 210, 315, 330, 346, 347, 404, 480, 488, 491, 593, 633, 646, 780, 795
Harvey, Daniel Whittle, Mr., 140, 213, 342, 598, 741, 938, 953, 1177, 1304
Herries, Right Hon. John C., 299, 310, 314, 472, 484, 546, 1312, 1314, 1364
Hobhouse, John Cam, Mr., 138, 212, 284, 297, 548, 1083, 1086, 1125, 1206
Hodges, Thomas Law, Mr., 125, 383, 972, 974
Hodgson, John, Mr., 512, 802, 953
Holdsworth, Arthur Howe, Mr., 574
Howard, Phillip Henry, Mr., 415, 790
Howick, Lord, 227
Hoy, James Barlow, Mr., 1214, 1216
Hughes, William Hughes, Mr., 174, 288, 344, 348, 810, 955
Hume, Joseph, Mr., 78, 127, 133, 144, 194, 195, 200, 208, 216, 228, 237, 245, 289, 310, 320, 345, 346, 347, 350, 353, 364, 429, 447, 480, 516, 518, 521, 523, 560, 575, 580, 591, 594, 596, 599, 626, 629, 632, 654, 655, 657, 670, 706, 741, 746, 747, 748, 1044, 1047, 1069, 1081, 1090, 1125, 1139, 1208, 1213, 1215, 1264, 1289, 1304, 1310, 1315, 1316, 1332, 1356, 1359, 1361, 1389

Ingilby, Sir William, 972
Inglis, Sir Robert H., 669, 744, 1182, 1206, 1316, 1320, 1356

Jephson, Charles D. O., Mr., 472, 488, 943, 1192
Johnstone, John H., Mr., 598, 952

Kennedy, Thomas F., Mr., 515, 516, 518, 743, 802, 807, 1043, 1066, 1186
Kenyon, Hon. Mr. Lloyd, 214
Killeen, Lord, 490, 1132,
Knatchbull, Sir Edward, 126, 337, 349, 787, 796

Labouchere, Henry, Mr., 228, 650, 794, 951
Lamb, Hon. George, 670, 706, 743, 807, 808, 994, 1378
Leader, Nicholas P., Mr., 150, 245, 426, 591, 671, 745, 999, 1009, 1126, 1299, 1392
Lefroy, Anthony, Mr., 776, 980, 1358, 1362
Lennard, Thomas B., Mr., 1081
Lennox, Lord George, 1043, 1121, 1214
Lewis, Right Hon. Thomas Frankland, 1125
Littleton, Edward John, Mr., 331, 333, 567, 741, 947, 1045, 1133, 1182, 1218, 1232,
Lumley, Saville, Mr., 1331, 1335

Maberly, John, Mr., 138, 139, 143, 244, 365, 580, 703, 794, 795, 810, 1001, 1008, 1079, 1121, 1123, 1216, 1231, 1305, 1309, 1367
Macauley, Thomas B., Mr., 647, 1059
Macdonald, Sir James, 563
Mackintosh, Right Hon. Sir James, 640
Mahon, James Patrick O'Gorman, 901, 1013, 1104, 1108, 1188, 1196, 1300, 1364, 1358, 1361, 1363
Marryatt, Joseph, Mr., 1048
Martin, John, Mr., 1229
Maxwell, Henry, Mr., 1191
Member, an Honourable, 1103
Moore, George, Mr., 587
Morpeth, Lord, 155, 349, 426, 514, 645, 649, 956, 1058, 1078, 1229, 1379

Murray, Right Hon. Sir George, 164, 515, 590, 1059

Newport, Right Hon. Sir John, 129, 583, 774, 909, 932, 980, 1181, 1305, 1350, 1380

Norreys, Lord, 349

North, John H. M., Mr., 742, 744

Nugent, Lord, 203, 514, 585, 596, 600, 1323, 1330

O'Brien, William S., Mr., 415, 662, 789, 931

O'Connell, Daniel, Mr., 97, 128, 137, 202, 206, 210, 211, 213, 237, 243, 318, 319, 323, 328, 331, 333, 342, 348, 350, 362, 386, 398, 408, 486, 490, 492, 513, 514, 574, 583, 586, 589, 592, 595, 624, 627, 628, 652, 668, 741, 744, 771, 773, 777, 778, 779, 827, 895, 897, 900, 928, 952, 971, 977, 997, 1000, 1005, 1065, 1073, 1108, 1131

O'Connor, Owen, Mr., 931, 952, 975, 1336

O'Ferral, R., Mr., 773, 1003

O'Grady, Colonel, 323, 575, 589, 1001, 1019, 1190, 1200, 1374

Ossory, the Earl of, 1131

Palmer, Robert, Mr., 204

Palmerston, Right Hon. Viscount, 193, 469, (Secretary for Foreign Affairs) 742, 796 948, 1067, 1076, 1106, 1316

Parnell, Right Hon. Sir Henry, 446, 470, 475, 484, 525, 797, 980, 1314

Patten, John Wilson, Mr., 1139, 1304, 1306

Peel, Right Hon. Sir Robert, (Secretary of State, Home Department) 5, 87, 126, 128, 129, 141, 175, 193, 195, 204, 209, 211, 215, 219, 227, 267, 279, 287, 296, 299, 334, 335, 336, 338, 351, 361, 363, 428, 459, 466, 486, 514, 520, 522, 523, 555, 561, 563, 569, 576, 579, 581, 629, (out of office) 633, 654, 670, 705, 742, 786, 788, 799, 800, 808, 926, 984, 991, 993, 994, 997, 1044, 1046, 1047, 1062, 1066, 1165, 1223, 1358, 1359, 1361, 1381, 1389, 1392, 1399

Pelham, Cresset, Mr., 204, 513, 569, 574, 768, 791, 899, 1044, 1181, 1207

Phillpots, John, Mr., 571, 620, 982, 1187

Portman, Edward Berkeley, Mr., 334, 335, 520, 567, 581

Powlett, Lord William, 1003

Price, Sir Robert, 1022

Price, Samuel Grove, Mr., 900, 985

Pringle, Alexander, Mr., 626

Rae, Sir William, 742, 806

Rice Thomas Spring, Mr., 122, 140, 315, 409, 417, 487, 592, 632, 652, 654, 669, 671, 704, 706, 746, 748, 750, 778, 780, 790, 791, 794, 826, 932, 1000

Ridley, Sir Matthew White, 427, 518, 566, 569, 598, 652, 810, 827, 997, 1093, 1366

Robinson, George, Mr., 157, 304, 481, 784, 792, 953, 1075, 1158, 1312, 1350, 1352, 1365

Ross, Charles, Mr., 1219

Russell, Charles, Mr., 970

Russell, Lord John, 811, 942, 956, 993, 1080, 1221

Ruthven, E. S., Mr., 350, 408, 490, 575, 598, 652, 662, 816, 889, 1001, 1108, 1193, 1328, 1360, 1370

Sadler, Michael Thomas Mr., 1152

Sandford, Edward, Mr., 349

Saint Paul, Sir Horace D. C. 1044, 1045

Scarlett, Sir James, (see Attorney General) 629, 1017, 1108, 1264

Sebright, Sir John, 1322

Shaw, Frederick, Mr., 319, 322

Shelley, Sir John, 349, 598

Sibthorp, Colonel, 235, 265, 280, 580, 748, 749, 784, 791, 951, 969, 971, 1059, 1067, 1088, 1327, 1335

Slaney, Mr., 293, 335, 1086, 1327, 1336, 1397

Smith, Robert Vernon, Mr., 416

Solicitor General, (Sir E. B. Sugden) 338, 345, 400, 582, 590

Speaker, The, (Right Hon. Charles Manners Sutton) 4, 7, 350, 631, 703, 704, 741, 986, 1042, 1120, 1122, 1123, 1125, 1214, 1301, 1310, 1351

Spence, George, Mr., 952, 1069

Spottiswoode, Andrew, Mr., 243

Stanley, Edward G., Mr., 216, 514, 555

Staunton, Sir George, 1221

Stewart, Henry Villiers, Mr., 397

Stewart, John, Mr., 1315

Stewart, Sir Michael Shaw, 743

Strutt, Edward, Mr., 825

Stuart, Lord Patrick James, 468

Sugden, Sir E. B., (see Solicitor General) 704, 741, 947, 954, 955, 1073, 1262, 1268, 1289

Sumner, George Holme, Mr., 519, 523, 547, 938

Sykes, Daniel 338, 566

Taylor, Michael Angelo, Mr., 130, 1285, 1379, 1399

Tennant, Charles, Mr., 362, 813, 1046, 1176

Tennyson, Charles, Mr., 146, 233, 318, 362, 365, 428, 703, 704, 802, 997, 1123, 1220, 1229, 1232, 1328

Thompson, William, Mr. Alderman, 286, 288, 809, 1122, 1124

Thomson, Right Hon. Charles Poulett, 426, 1174, 1311, 1316, 1363, 1366

Trefusis, Mr., 173

Trevor, Hon. Arthur, 175, 1184, 1212, 1311

Trevor, Hon. George Rice, 650, 790

Twiss, Horace, Mr., 941, 1077, 1085, 1232

Valentia, Lord Viscount, 1191

Valletort, Lord Viscount, 947

Villiers, Thomas Hyde, 1159
Vivian, General Sir Richard Hussey, 1094

Waithman, Alderman Robert, Mr., 140, 158, 215, 280, 412, 564, 796, 1045, 1078, 1090, 1107, 1124, 1305, 1310, 1311, 1324
Walsh, Sir John, 920
Warburton, Henry, Mr., 245, 315, 472, 559, 581, 670, 793, 794, 812, 813, 826, 904, 953, 1125, 1179, 1216, 1230, 1327
Ward, William, Mr., 590, 1125
Warrender, Right Hon. Sir George, 653, 781, 792, 984, 1021, 1022, 1187, 1231
Wellesley, Hon. W. P. T. L., 72, 598, 649, 789, 990, 998, 999, 1049, 1067, 1320
Wells, John, Mr., 1121
Wetherell, Sir Charles, 206, 207, 486, 670, 703, 954, 974, 1107, 1195, 1262, 1289
Weyland, John, Mr., 157, 227
Whitmore, Wm. Wolryche, Mr., 471
Wilks, John, Mr., 579, 669, 671, 704, 806, 810, 826, 828, 1047, 1078, 1207
Williams, John, Mr., 1403
Wilson, Sir Robert, 428, 575, 810, 898, 1006, 1020, 1124
Winchester, Alderman Henry, Mr., 810
Wood, Charles, Mr., 649
Wood, John, Mr., 142, 147, 213, 349, 574, 624, 670, 799, 814, 825
Wood, Alderman Matthew, Mr., 560, 1124, 1207
Wood, Colonel Thomas, 811
Wortley, Hon. John Stuart, 518, 582, 653
Wrottesley, Sir John, 336, 427
Wynn, Right Hon. Charles W. Williams, 143, 200, 207, 486, 519, 545, 567
Wynne, Charles, Mr., 932
Wyse, Thomas, jun., Mr., 405, 655, 662, 744, 930, 1208, 1306

Yorke, Hon. Sir Joseph Sidney, 4, 76, 626, 1077, 1092

ADVERTISEMENT.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES—(HANSARD'S).

"HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES consists of two Series: the *first*, in Forty-one Volumes, commencing with the year 1803, and ending at the period of the Death of George the Third: the *second*, commencing with the Accession of his late Majesty, George the Fourth, the completion of whose reign (with the exception of the prorogation by his successor) will conclude the Twenty-fifth Volume of that Series.

"To the fidelity and strict impartiality with which it has been conducted, testimony of the most flattering description has been borne by nearly every one of our great Public Men, and by all our most distinguished Literary Journals. In the thirty-eighth number of the *Quarterly Review* will be found an elaborate article, written by the late Mr. CANNING, on Mr. Brougham's Education Committee and the Reform of Charity Abuses. Having, in the course of it, occasion to refer to the Debates in Parliament on the Renewal of the War in 1815, and to those on the State of the Country in 1816 and 1817, that eminent man took occasion to pronounce HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES to be "*a Record, which, for fidelity, fulness, and despatch, has certainly never been equalled.*"

"Neither has the *Edinburgh Review* withheld its meed of approbation. 'We cannot,' it says, speaking of this Work, and of its companion, THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY of ENGLAND;—'we cannot quote this careful and judicious Collection without bearing testimony to its singular merits. It deserves, as well as the New Edition of the STATE TRIALS, undertaken by the same Proprietors, to be numbered among the most useful and best conducted Works of late years. Both are *indispensable parts of all Collections of English History*.' This latter panegyric came, like the former, from the pen of one of the most distinguished men of the day.

"It is hardly necessary to add, that a Work which has been thus spoken of, and which, in consequence, has found its way into most of the great public and private Libraries, not only of the United Empire, but of Europe and America, will continue to be conducted with that fidelity and perseverance which a reception so flattering is calculated to produce. As a book of Parliamentary-historical Reference it will continue to be, '*indispensable*.'

"In addition to the Debates of both Houses, the Work contains an invaluable collection of Parliamentary Papers, consisting of many hundred Reports, Estimates, Returns, Protests, Petitions, Treaties, Conventions, Lists of Divisions, &c. &c.; together with a regular Series, for the last twenty-five years, of Accounts relative to the Finances and to the Trade and Navigation of the United Kingdom. These documents are exact copies of those laid before Parliament. They are to be met with in no other publication, and will be found eminently convenient and useful to the Reader: to whom, indeed, if his attention be at all turned to subjects of Political Economy, they are essentially necessary. By aid of the INDEX hereafter announced they will be capable of instant reference.

"Finding that others have taken to themselves some merit by the adoption of an original feature of this Work, Mr. Hansard has been induced to resume it; and to give, in a condensed form, the minor proceedings of each day, under the head of ' MINUTES,' wherever they can be of use, regarding the time of publication, either as matter of immediate information to the parties interested, or of future reference.

" The Paper and the Printing, in consequence of the recently-invented machinery in their respective departments, will be found to have been much improved; and no expense or labour will be spared to render the Work deserving of that increasing patronage which it has, for so many years, enjoyed."

The Volume usually consists of about forty-five sheets extra royal octavo, large page of double column, in type similar to that of this Advertisement. To the Volumes of the Session are affixed, a copious Table of Contents containing List of Matters debated upon in either House—Alphabetical Lists of Members who have spoken upon any subject.—An official Roll of the House of Peers; and a List of the Members of the House of Commons, distinguishing the place for which each sat in that Session; and a List of all places returning Members, with the names of those Members;—such Lists will be continued for every future session.

The Volumes have been published at £1. 11*s.* 6*d.* boards; or £1. 15*s.* half bound, russia, fully lettered; the Price, (from Volume 22,) is reduced to £1. 10*s.* boards, £1. 13*s.* half bound. The Sessions have varied in quantity, making sometimes two, sometimes three Volumes; the last year, from the extraordinary length and importance of the Debates, Four Volumes were unavoidable. The work is, for convenience of current reference, published in Parts, Five making a Volume, at 6*s.* each.

A very small number of perfect Sets, viz. from the year 1803 to the Death of George III., Forty-one Volumes; and (SECOND SERIES) commencing with the Accession of his late Majesty George the IVth, and continued to the 9th year of his reign, 1828, in Nineteen Volumes, remain on hand: notwithstanding which, as the purchaser of so large a Work must necessarily be at a considerable sacrifice of expense, the Proprietor is willing to dispose of a certain number, in complete Sets of Sixty Volumes, *at a discount of* 30 *per cent from the publishing prices, if taken within this year.*

Immediately connected with this Work, is

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY,

From the earliest Period of Parliament, 6 Wm. I. 1072, to 43 Geo. III. 1803, in Thirty-six Volumes.

The History and Debates thus forming the only complete Legislative History of England extant. *These will be sold at a similar discount.*

" Of THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY it is not too much to say, that it has completely superseded all former Collections. In the preface to the recently-published posthumous work of the great modern Historian, Archdeacon Coxe—(" Memoirs of the Pelham Administration,")—there is the following valuable tribute to its merits. Speaking of the Parliamentary Journal of the hon. Philip Yorke, eldest son of Lord Chancellor Hardwicke, Mr. Coxe says, " This curious narrative, containing a faithful account of " the Proceedings of the Lower House, recorded under the impression of the " moment, and accompanied with occasional views of the political history " and character of the times, has been printed by Mr. HANSARD, in his "collection of Parliamentary Debates. I have likewise examined and compared the reports of the speeches given in the Gentleman's and the London Magazines: but, in tracing the proceedings of the Legislature, I have derived the greatest assistance from 'THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY' published by Mr. HANSARD; which forms *an invaluable and indispensable appendage to our national annals, and contains a vast mass of curious information.*"

In order to render the before-named Works more generally useful, there is now in the Press

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DIGEST;

OR,

INDEX OF READY REFERENCE

To the recorded Debates and Proceedings in both Houses, from the earliest Period to the present Time: being an Analytical Index:—I. to The Parliamentary History of England, from the earliest Period to the Year 1803. II. to The Parliamentary Debates, from the Year 1803 to 1830. With an INDEX containing the Name of every Member who took a part in the said Debates and Proceedings. In Two Volumes. The *Second* Volume (for the Debates Sixty-two Volumes) will be *first* published, and as a great portion of the Work is already in the hands of the Printer, this very essential Volume will appear in the course of a few months.

Another Work, equally connected with the History of our Country, is now brought up to the last Case of public importance.

A COMPLETE COLLECTION OF STATE TRIALS and Proceedings for High Treason and other Crimes and Misdemeanors, from the earliest Period to the Year 1783, with Notes and other Illustrations: compiled by T. B. HOWELL, Esq. F.R.S. F.S.A. and continued from the Year 1783 to the present Time, by THOMAS JONES HOWELL, Esq., his son.

With an INDEX Volume, by D. JARDINE, ESQ.

The whole complete in Thirty-four Volumes, at £1. 11s. 6d. per Volume, taken singly; but if in the complete Set, a discount will be allowed upon this Work, as upon the preceding, of 30 *per cent.*

⁂ *Such Members of the two Houses as may wish to communicate on the subject of the Works, are requested to forward their favours to* MR. BIGG, *Office for* HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, *Parliament-street, Westminster, or to* MR. HANSARD, *at* THE PRESS, *Paternoster Row.*